

Social Economy and Developmental Disabilities: An Employment Option that Promotes
a Form of Authentic Work and Fosters Social Inclusion

Anne E. Readhead, B.A. with Honours

Centre for Applied Disabilities

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Faculty of Social Sciences, Brock University

St. Catharines, Ontario

©2012

Abstract

Typical employment options for people with developmental disabilities are insufficient. Most employment opportunities that are community-based provide typical workplace and geographical inclusion but tend not to support social inclusion and “belonging”. This study explored the innovative employment alternative of social businesses and considered this form of employment for persons with a developmental disability as a viable avenue for meaningful work and social inclusion. A total of six business partners with a developmental disability were interviewed; two partners from three separate worker owned businesses. The partners’ descriptions of their job and their workplace composed the interpretative findings. The social businesses provided an avenue for this group of people who tend to be segregated in isolated workshops or marginalized in mainstream work environments and who feel a sense of being “outsiders” to participate in meaningful work in community settings. This group of partners described their job as authentic “work” and discussed the many skills and the work ethic learned from their employment opportunity. In addition to the instrumental aspects of the job, the partners also discussed the group autonomy and self-determination of being their own “bosses”. The partners confidently expressed feeling valued, understood in the context of others with similar life experiences, attached to the workplace and connected to a larger community as important outcomes of their businesses. These criteria of social inclusion (Hall, 2010) were complemented by teamwork, friendship and ultimately, with a feeling of being genuine “insiders”. Replication of this innovative employment model would be recommended for groups of marginalized people with DD in other geographic areas.

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Common Ground Cooperative staff for their generosity in assisting and providing the resources for this study to be possible. More so, I would like to thank all the partners of the Coffee Sheds who gave me not only their time but remarkable insight into their partnership and businesses.

On a personal note, I have deep gratitude toward my fellow students at Brock University who were always friendly, supportive and encouraging.

My family and friends cannot go unmentioned. My husband, John Kuehn-Cadwell, was the dominant force of my stability as he persisted to encourage throughout my academic endeavours.

Finally, I would like to express genuine appreciation toward the supervisory committee members of this thesis. Dr. Maureen Connolly and Dr. Donato Tarulli provided valuable and inspirational mentoring. It was an honour to learn from such magnificent people. Ultimately, and unforgettably, I recognize Dr. Frances Owen who was not only my thesis supervisor but a true pedagogue. Her patience, enthusiasm, availability and extraordinary wisdom are the foundation of this thesis. Thank you for making a dream reality!

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Introduction	1
Literature Review	4
Historical Overview	9
Social Economy.....	17
A Social Purpose Enterprise for Persons with a Developmental Disability	20
Social Inclusion	22
Four Traditional Principles to Guide the Process of Social Inclusion	24
Rights	24
Independence.....	24
Personal choice.....	24
Personal control.....	25
Three Indicators of Social Inclusion and “Insiderness”	26
Attachment to the work environment.....	26
Valued	26
Connected to the community	26
Researcher’s Perspective.....	27
Methodology	28
Purpose of the Study	28
Research Design.....	28
Participants	29

SOCIAL ECONOMY AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

Recruitment	30
Recruitment worksite locations.....	31
Sample selection.....	32
Inclusion criteria.....	33
Final participant sample	33
Three Worksite Locations	33
Data Collection.....	34
Semi-structured interviews.....	35
Data Analysis	35
Descriptive thematic analysis.....	35
Phase 1: Transcription.....	38
Phase 2: NVivo.....	39
Phase 3: NVivo tree nodes	39
Phase 4: Emergent themes.....	40
Phase 5: Overall analysis summary and research inquiry	40
Results	40
Partners Description of Their Job.....	40
Job status	41
Job acquisition.....	41
Job choice.....	41
Job duties.....	42
Learning on the job	42
Teaching on the job	43

SOCIAL ECONOMY AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

The described nature of the job	43
Partners' Prior Job Experiences and History.....	44
Competitive employment and community jobs	44
Employability and job experience of mainstream employer.....	45
Job Goals and Dreams.....	45
Dream job	46
Job Income	46
Ontario Disabilities Support Program	46
Income satisfaction.....	47
Job Satisfaction	47
What partners liked about their job	48
What partners disliked about their job	48
Difference the job has made in their life	49
Business Ownership, Independence and Job or Decision-making Authority	49
Owners of Common Ground Cooperative and Coffee Shed.....	49
The boss of the Coffee Shed	50
Independence and support on the job	50
Decision-making on the job	50
Business ownership, independence and decision-making.....	51
Success of and Being Part of the Business.....	51
Success of the business	51
Being part of the Coffee Shed or the business	52
Rights	53

SOCIAL ECONOMY AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

Being Valued and Respected.....	54
Business Advice	54
Advice to a new partner	54
Advice for someone starting a new social purpose enterprise	55
Emergent Themes.....	56
Partnership.....	56
Relationships	58
Customers.....	58
Job coaches.....	58
Partners.....	59
Friendships	59
Relationship components	60
Work Ethic	60
Work rules	60
Group dynamics	60
Teamwork.....	61
Within Worksite Themes	61
One worksite	61
A second worksite	62
The third worksite	63
Across-Sites Themes	65
Discussion	66
The Four Traditional Principles of Social Inclusion	67

SOCIAL ECONOMY AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

Independence and interdependence.....	69
Rights	70
Personal choice.....	70
Personal control.....	71
The four principles of social inclusion.....	72
Hall's (2010) Three Criteria for Social Inclusion	72
Feeling valued	72
Feeling connected to the community	73
Feeling of attachment to the work environment.....	74
Limitations of the Study.....	75
Conclusion.....	76
References	79
Appendix A	85
Appendix B	86
Appendix C	88
Appendix D	91
Appendix E.....	94

Introduction

Employment options for people with a developmental disability (DD) in Canada have not proven to be sufficient (Crawford, 2011). This group of people have experienced a history of physical and social exclusion in the workforce. Segregated workshops have exploited and demeaned this population by providing meaningless, unpaid work tasks. More recently, persons with a DD have been supported in typical jobs in the mainstream labour market. With this form of employment option, the emphasis has been placed on paid employment as the key marker of “social inclusion” (Hall, 2004). Many people with a DD have faced the dilemma of marginalization, experiencing the exclusionary situation of abjection and discrimination within the actual workplaces that were marked as key places of social inclusion. As Hall (2005) has suggested, “it is a significant assumption that once [people with disabilities] are ‘normalized’ into the social roles of worker... they will experience less discrimination and be incorporated into other mainstream social spaces and activities” (p. 109), however, this assumption has failed to be true.

Social inclusion as the “opposite” of social exclusion has created the viewpoint that persons with a DD should have the same employment opportunities as others and the expectation for them is to strive to achieve the same skills in order to maintain the same work opportunities. Hall (2011) has discussed that this focus on the “employability” of persons with a disability has created geographical inclusion for this group, however, it has placed these people in a mainstream work environment that tends to socially marginalize them and discriminate against them. Thus, social exclusion has remained

unresolved in typical mainstream employment options for persons with a DD and they have continued to be treated as “outsiders” even within the mainstream arena.

A broader restructuring of how work is socially and geographically organized has been the recommended perspectival shift (Hall, 2010). Instead of defining social inclusion as the “opposite” of exclusion, the viewpoint of the current study was to explore the perspectival shift that social inclusion should be defined by this group of people “within” themselves. This includes seeking alternative work spaces of inclusion. New spaces of authentic inclusion should foster “...a sense of safety and a type of ‘inclusion’ [that] can be achieved by self-exclusion from spaces and activities of the majority” (Hall, 2005, p. 109). These new spaces would accommodate the different levels of ability on the job and possess close proximity to a greater community. People with a DD should be able to access inclusionary space without being exposed to the hardships put forward by the traditional approach to social inclusion. “[I]t can perhaps be argued that it is not employment *per se* that people demand, but access to the resources of the majority and a position of respect in society” (Hall, 2005, p. 113).

The purpose of the current study was to examine the social purpose enterprise (SPE), Common Ground Cooperative, and through the narrative of the businesses’ partners, consider the level of social inclusion that was described in reference to two different definitions of social inclusion. The first definition reflects the traditional viewpoint of key components which guide and nurture social inclusion. Four principles are considered to be necessary for social inclusion to exist. The four principles are independence, rights, personal choice and personal control. The second definition developed by Hall (2010) described social inclusion as people with a DD feeling a sense

of “insiderness” and belonging. Hall’s (2010) three criteria for belonging included people with a disability feeling valued, feeling attached to their workplace and feeling connected to a larger community.

Three SPE Coffee Sheds, each in different locations in Toronto, were examined and the businesses’ partners who each had a DD were interviewed. The partners’ descriptions of their job duties, work conditions and business responsibilities summarized the conclusion that CGC supported SPE enterprises which promoted social inclusion in terms of Hall’s (2010) three criteria. The partners complimented these finding by also describing their businesses as an opportunity for authentic and meaningful work. The Coffee Sheds were described as an employment option that provided a sense of “insiderness” and belonging for the partners involved.

To clarify terminology within this current study, developmental disability (DD) and intellectual disability (ID) were used interchangeably. The term employment referred to a person’s career, where the term work was interchangeable with the term job. Both work and job referred to a specific labour position as well as referring to specific labour tasks and included the required tasks, skills and knowledge for that position. Partners of the Coffee Sheds were described as legal owners of the businesses (partnership) and their position as a partner was considered a form of employment regardless of income earned. With discussion of different employment models, the Coffee Sheds were concluded to represent a mixed model in comparison to exclusionary and inclusionary employment models. This study appears to be the first research conducted involving such an innovative social business approach as an employment option for persons with a DD. Databases including Academic Search Premier and

PsychLit were searched for sheltered/competitive employment/work, social economy/business, social inclusion and intellectual/developmental disabilities and no studies were found in reference to this kind of mixed model of supported entrepreneurship involving persons with a DD.

Literature Review

Persons with a developmental disability (DD) in Canada experience high rates of unemployment and unacceptably low income support. Lack of employment opportunity hinders their freedom from poverty, isolation and social exclusion. According to the Canadian Association for Community Living (June 2010), 75% of Canadians with a DD live in poverty and only 45.5% of working adults with a DD receive income support. As long as persons with a DD continue to be excluded from the labour market, stigma and stereotypes about their labour capabilities will persist (Grant, 2008). Adults, regardless of having a disability or not, find employment is an essential activity in their life. Along with income, it can provide social status, self-esteem and improved quality of life. For many years, a “deficit model”, which traditionally would focus on a person’s disability and modifying their abilities to adapt a standard of norm, projected a social attitude that did little to reduce the barriers to exclusion of persons with a disability (Parkinson, 2006; Galambos, 1999). An alternative to a “deficit model” would be social economy based cooperative businesses that open the employment market and provide the opportunity for those with a DD “to live interdependently and to participate as partners in their own businesses” (Lemon & Lemon, 2003, p. 414). This study examined the perceptions and experiences of persons with a DD who were associated with a social business, Common

Ground Cooperative (CGC) that operates three social business enterprises in Toronto, Ontario.

Persons with a DD are extremely under-represented in the employment sector. Historically, this group of people have faced an abundance of physical and social barriers in the job market. Human services have moved away from advocating that adults with a DD work in segregated placement settings such as institutional jobs or sheltered workshops (Baker, 2007). Typical community jobs and regular competitive employment are assumed to be the center of interest for people with a DD who desire to work (Lemon & Lemon, 2003). However, the majority of persons with a DD continue to obtain work activity only in sheltered workshops, volunteer positions, or are offered work activity in the community that involves a small number of hours per week with token wages and continued social abjection (Grant, 2008; Hall, 2004, 2005, 2010). The Canadian Association for Community Living have advocated that adults with a DD should have the opportunity and options in regards to paid employment in the regular community labour market. “Despite investment and programmatic efforts, the employment rate for Canadians with intellectual disabilities is only one-third of the employment rate of people without a disability (25.5% compared to 75.5%)” (Canadian Association for Community Living, June 2010). For those with DD who do work, their income was estimated as lower than half of people who do not have a DD. The Canadian Association for Community Living (2010) stated that these statistics are not acceptable.

Many people with a DD depend on government income support for subsistence. This government income is distributed monthly by the Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP), which provides social assistance for persons with a formally diagnosed

disability such as a DD (CLEO, 2010). The social assistance of ODSP also offers an employment support program to assist people with finding a job or upgrading their skills. Ontario Disability Support Program describes employment in terms of earning at least minimum wage, moreover, earnings are deducted from the person's income support (CLEO, 2010). According to the Employment Standards Act (2000), an "employee" is defined as a person who performs work, or supplies services or who is a homemaker for an employer for wages (ESA, part 1, s.[1]). Under this act, wages are defined as at least minimum wage (ESA, 2000, part 9, s. 23[1]). In reference to these definitions, and for the purpose of terminological clarity in the study, the use of the term *employment* will describe community work activity that includes payment of at least minimum wage. In regards to this current study that focused on the social aspect of peoples' work instead of the level of income, employment was used to label varying forms of community and integrated work activity for persons with a DD.

When discussing one's job many people speak of their work as a source of income. For most adults, work is an essential aspect of their daily lives. The social norm of today is that people expect to and are assumed to work for the greater part of their adult life (Sandys, 1999). Along with being a source of income to supplement their needs and their wants, work can influence self-identity and how a person is perceived by others. According to Sandys (1999, p. 140), "most people say they want work that is interesting and challenging, provides opportunities to learn new skills, has good co-workers, and makes a difference". This study was based on the assumption that employment plays a crucial role in peoples' lives. This assumption applies no less to people with a DD. There

is an important social aspect to employment in addition to the economic necessity. This social component was seen in CGC; a SPE for persons with a DD.

As described by J. Campbell (Personal Communication, December 14th, 2010):

Common Ground Cooperative (CGC) [in Toronto, Canada] is a non-profit charity that supports four social purpose enterprises. A social purpose enterprise (SPE) is a business operated by a non-profit organization that has the dual purpose of generating income and achieving social or environmental goals. Our societal aim at Common Ground is to bring together talent and expertise found in existing institutions, agencies, businesses and other community groups to support the creation and maintenance of business enterprises for persons with developmental disabilities.

Lemon and Allspice Cookery was started in 1998 as an alternative to sheltered workshops and the mainstream employment placements for persons with developmental disabilities. The success of the Cookery led to the creation of CGC in 2000 to establish the enterprise for the long-term. Since CGC's development three new SPE have been formed in connection with the Lemon & Allspice Cookery. These partnerships have been identified as providing the dignity of meaningful and sustainable employment (J. Campbell, 2010).

Lemon and Lemon (2003) described the CGC social business as a project that has addressed employment opportunities for persons with a DD with community based initiatives, enabling them to participate in the life of their community in a meaningful

way. This employment option provides the opportunity for people with a DD to participate in typical employment roles and experience their personal career development that can manifest through the responsibility of working at an community job. Personal growth would be considered an important aspect of human development that could be initiated and promoted through community involvement such as the activity of typical employment.

From a sociocultural-historical perspective and according to Rogoff (2003): “Humans develop through their changing participation in their sociocultural activities of their communities, which also change” (p. 11). The circumstances of the historical era impacts the community activities one may experience and spark human development. Cultural practices surround us all and involve many aspects of community functioning. “From infancy through adulthood, people’s assumption of roles expected of their developmental phase, and the skills associated with them, reflect community goals, technologies, and practices. “ (Rogoff, 2003, p. 181). For example in middle-class Canadian families, children are not considered capable of being left unsupervised to care for themselves before the age of 12 years. In comparison, in Guatemala, a five year girl may be left to care for an infant and in Fore New Guinea, toddlers handle knives and fire in a safe manner by the time they can walk. Rogoff (2003) was making the point that human development and community responsibilities and activities are interdependent. Persons with a DD would benefit no less from the experience of human development in their opportunity to carry the responsibility of working and owning a community business. Following Rogoff’s ideas of community participation and human development, the stigma of person’s with a DD as “the perpetual child” (Simmons,1982) is put to rest.

This is a departure from the extended history of marginalization, neglect and abuse that person's who have a DD experienced historically and that persist in some jurisdictions around the world.

Historical Overview

Scheerenberger (1983) describes the prehistoric practice of killing infants born with a visible disability, as well as the mother. Archeological findings also suggest evidence of numerous primitive tribes favouring and protecting disabled infants (Scheerenberger, 1983). Interestingly, he also remarks there is evidence of primitive groups who sustained physically disabled adults by securing them in a safe location. Here, Scheerenberger (1983) recounts two ancient social practices, one of eradication and one of nurture. It is thought-provoking that these two practices have continued through history and although they are present in opposing format, they remain evident today. Social treatment of persons with a DD through history reflects the perceived human belief that it is better to protect a vulnerable person from the larger group and to protect the group from this person's socially unaccepted characteristics (Owen & Griffiths, 2009). This dual social perception has supported the practices of segregation and exclusion of persons with a disability throughout history. During the twentieth century, institutions prospered in numbers and size, reflecting the dominant social belief that it was necessary to establish social control for persons characterized as "mentally defective" (Owen & Griffiths, 2009). One form of social control was represented in the custodial movement and another in eugenics. The ideological foundation for both of these focuses of social control was the "myth of the menace of the feeble-minded" (Simmons, 1982, p. 50) which suggested that such a condition was inherited.

The scientific belief in eugenics promoted and added fuel to such movements as infanticide, Hitler's quest for the perfect race, sterilization and genetic screening; all practices that devalue a person with a disability. In the past, the eugenics movement encouraged the belief in medical researchers of genetic elimination of disabilities for the purpose of human betterment. The eugenic movement was reinforced with such research as Goddard's history of the Kallikak family.

He concluded that because of their lack of control, sexual immortality, fertility and the crime and delinquency they spread, the feeble-minded constituted a menace to society and should be removed, controlled and sterilized (Owen & Griffiths, 2009, p.27).

In the mid nineteenth century, the eugenics movement promoted the use of intelligence testing to segregate people to asylums for "idiots". Intelligence testing resulted in the categorization of levels of mental defectiveness (Scheerenberger, 1983). The label of "feeble-mindedness" as well as other categories (idiots, imbeciles, and morons) was applied to persons with a DD during this era and following. At the beginning of the twentieth century, these categories were significant in a legislative manner as the law permitted the institutionalization of only idiots and lunatics (Carleson, 2001). These labels designated a medical condition and proposed compulsory institutionalization of those identified as "mental defectives" (Simmons, 1982). Carleson (2001) has described how this created social oppression and inequity of power relations due to the belief that feeble-mindedness was seen as being hereditary. Those with such a label were not allowed to procreate. To avoid the spread of feeble-mindedness, the justification for such persons being incarcerated or institutionalized grew. This group of people required protection

from society and society needed protection from them (Carleson, 2001; Scheerenberger, 1983). Thus began the custodial model of care (Lord & Hearn, 1987).

Carleson (2001) describes American institutions for idiots which used the women residents as their female labour. Carlson (2001) recounts the role played by women in the institutions in the mid nineteenth century:

“the importance of women working in the institutions as attendants, teachers, and matrons.... [They] were responsible for caring for other more severely ‘feeble-minded’ patients. While the men worked on the farm (many institutions were on large pieces of farmland) and did manual labour, ‘feeble-minded’ women learned basket weaving, sewing, and nursing, and most importantly, they cared for the low-grade idiots and imbeciles” (p.129).

In this circumstance there was a social designation of the labour force and this group of people was exploited and marginalized as their labour served the needs of the institutional system, which in turn restricted their social and physical freedom. The institutionalized residents were responsible for the majority of the institution’s basic operations (Scheerenberger, 1983).

In Ontario, by the late 1800s, many persons with a DD resided and were cared for with psychiatric patients in large institutions that were hospital-like facilities located in rural areas. This segregated existence was fuelled by the belief that these people did not fit into society and they were marked as deviant. Alongside the goal of protecting the community from the unacceptable behaviour of these people, was the goal of rehabilitating them for re-entry to the community. “The earliest work programs for those

with developmental disabilities were started within those institutions.” (Sandys, 1999, p. 141). This unpaid work assisted in cutting costs in the institutional budgets. The conditions in the institutions in Ontario were notably poor. The facilities ran on extremely low budgets and charity at a time when charity was not favoured (Scheerenberger, 1983). “By the 1930s they [persons with a DD] would be merely awkward and potentially expensive objects of a policy which seemed to have no other goal than to remove them from the community and house them as efficiently, as cheaply and with as little fuss as possible” (Simmons, 1982, p. 108).

During the 1940s and 1950s, the image of feeble-mindedness shifted to the “perpetual child” and redefined persons with a DD in the institutions. This image would have generated the perception of an adult with DD as unable to reach a level of human development deemed fit for life responsibilities such as maintaining a position of employment. “The feeble-minded were said to be permanent children, they were people with the bodies of adults but the minds of children” (Simmons, 1982, p. 72). During this time, the “parents movement” (Simmons, 1982) started forming groups that began community based programs for children with a DD. The absence of community services for persons with a DD catalyzed the development of the parent movement because parents were left with the unthinkable option of institutionalizing their child or the impossible alternative of coping with their child on their own (Flynn & Lemay, 1999). Community services that did exist commonly did not meet the needs of some families as research later concluded by recognizing that “primary caregivers are at considerable risk of high stress, clinical depression and a low quality of life... contributing to their eventual decision to seek out-of-home placement” (Mirfin-Veitch et al, 2003, p. 109). The

psychological demands of caring for a family member with a DD were underestimated as parents, usually mothers, carried the emotional responsibility of institutional placement and the resulting guilt (Mirfin-Veitch et al, 2003). This was an era when specialized services were absent or few, community members were harshly rejecting of persons with disabilities and the care demands were intense and long-term for a family (Lord & Hearn, 1987). As Lord and Hearn (1987) reported:

the powerlessness that families felt in the world of medical experts was usually reinforced in the world of education experts. Parents increasingly felt like ‘outsiders’ in relation to their community and to the services supposedly designed to help. This pattern of being an ‘outsider’ was repeated for all the families with whom we talked (p. 11).

By the 1960s, this image of exclusion as an acceptable existence was changing into a more sensitive and humane perception and institutional living was being challenged. Old notions of the necessity to protect persons with a DD from society and, in turn, to protect society from them began to change and the focus moved to deinstitutionalization and the opportunity for community integration. Principles of normalization (Wolfensberger, 1972) and the criticism of institutional living revealed that the lifestyle of persons with a DD was not even close to the typical lifestyle of other people. Nirje (1999) compared a typical day for a person with a disability and without a disability and declared a need for a commitment to human rights advocacy. The idea of normalization evolved from the predominant social beliefs of many Western societies which felt at that time that it was significant to address the equal rights of numerous devalued and oppressed groups (Owen & Griffiths, 2009). The theory of Social Role

Valorization (SRV) by Wolfensberger (2000) developed as a philosophy to portray persons with a DD in terms of socially valued community roles. Wolfensberger's (2000) SRV approach emphasized full community integration and suggested moving devalued persons with a DD from institutions to a valued part of society, their community. This theory marked the onset of the focus on individual choice, self-determination and person-centered services (O'Brien & Tuck, 2001). The shift from institutional labour to workshop labour initiated the trend to open employment options for people with a DD.

By the mid 1900s, potential community jobs began to open up in the form of sheltered workshops (Scheerenberger, 1987). These workshops were organized in Ontario and operated by local groups and organizations that were headed by parents of persons with a DD and later became government funded. The sheltered workshop setting provided training and skill acquisition as well as long-term protected daily activity (Sandys, 1999). In Ontario, the Williston (1971) report revealed institutional failings and lack of existing community services. This report brought about important legislative changes transferring all services for persons with a DD (labelled mental retardation at that time) from the Ministry of Health to the Ministry of Community and Social Services (Flynn & Lemay, 1999). Human services were steered by the social movement of deinstitutionalization and community integration. The lives of persons with a DD changed dramatically from institutional isolation to a place in their community where they would not be seen as "burdens" (Lemon & Lemon, 2003).

By the late 1980s, there was concern that sheltered workshops were not successful in preparing participants to transfer their skills to community employment because very few individuals moved from the workshop setting into mainstream employment (Lemon

& Lemon, 2003; Scheerenberger, 1987). Job placement programs and mobile work crews were developed (Sandys, 1999). Some workshops continued to operate with other sources of funding, such as United Way-Centraide Canada, once government funding was relinquished, along with income generated by contract work with community businesses. This contract work was criticized for its repetitive and tedious nature and its extremely low wages in comparison to what any community worker would have been paid (Sandys, 1999).

Work placement in the sheltered workshop environment bore little resemblance to the experience of employment in a competitive work site (Scheerenberger, 1987; Wolfensberger, 1972). In the sheltered workshop, persons with a DD were usually involved with repetitive tasks producing goods and services. This work took place in a segregated environment that solely employed persons with a DD and was completely adapted to this population. Their stipends were minimal if not absent altogether (Scheerenberger, 1983). In theory, workshops were developed to give persons with a DD the opportunity to participate within a work structure and to develop work skills. The intent of skill development was to prepare persons with a DD to move to a community job (Lachapelle, 2003). However, while sheltered workshops provided job training, for the majority of persons with a DD, they continued to serve as a long-term protected workplace (Sandys, 1999). From the perspective of the theory of normalization, sheltered workshop placement was challenged with the progressive belief that “assumes that a person is capable of functioning at a level higher than his present one and that a person’s capacity can best be tested and developed in real work situations” (Wolfensberger, 1972, p. 158). There are three main predictors of a person with a DD obtaining access to the

community: first, the person is not living in an institution; second, the person has prevalent socially adaptive behaviour; and third, the person has formal community access goals (Baker, 2007). With the growing focus on normalization and community integration, supported work programs became the new innovation (Scheerenberger, 1987).

For people capable of more valued contributions, “human rights activists believe that ...workshops are exploitative and segregated and prevent people with intellectual disabilities from integration into the wider community” (Lemon & Lemon, 2003, p.417). With emphasis on human rights, persons with a DD are increasingly viewed as a significant group who have been marginalized in almost all areas of life. “The International Year of Disabled Persons and the Canadian Charter of Rights proclaimed in 1982 raised awareness about the discrimination faced by people with handicaps” (Lord & Hearn, 1987, p. 3). As stated by Condeluci (2002), deinstitutionalization resulted in nothing more than “trans-institutionalization” rather than a transformation. The belief in integration and inclusion contributed to human services reaching for supports that included work among the general population for persons with a DD. Yet, social barriers persisted. Condeluci described a lack of community reception as being the result of people in the community not having enough exposure and occasion to meet and get to know persons with disabilities. This social identity reinforced an “us” verses “them” view of persons with disabilities. However, the benefit of community employment was that it offered increased integration of persons with DD into the community and into the work force (Lemon & Lemon, 2003).

Two other forms of work placements for persons with a DD are supported employment and self-employment. The first, supported employment, is defined as a community job paid by an employer. For a person with a DD this may include a job coach to offer training and to aim for future independence; or a support worker to assist the person with a DD in job completion on a continuous basis (Sandys, 1999). In many cases work payment consists of stipends of a token amount often equal to a few dollars a day. However, the social integration of the community work activity is valued as a positive trade off. The second, self-employment, describes a person with a DD who does not work for an employer, but rather who works at their own business as a contractor for a community employer (Sandys, 1999).

Self-employment is the form of service model for people with a DD that was examined in the present study of SPE owned by persons with DD. A SPE is described as a number of people who are partners in the business in which they all work. They make decisions jointly and share in the profits or losses of the business. This runs parallel to Hall's (2010) definition of "inclusion" as being more than a traditional structure of independence, rights, control and choices but rather he states that to belong involves a sense of "insiderness". This point of view will be expanded upon later in this study. First, a description of how social businesses operate and function will provide foundational information to understanding the workplace examined in this study.

Social Economy

Social business, according to Muhammad Yunus (2007), is an investor/owner based enterprise that serves a social objective and a non-loss/non-dividend requirement. Yunus (2007) states that capitalism is in need of a broader perspective where, in the past

the focus was exclusively on profit-making, now social profit is also included. The key ambition of a social business rests on the design and operation of the business. Profit making is an important feature of operations as sustainability is essential to the design and surplus profit is returned to the investors interest-free. The business profit remains with the company to enhance business quality and growth (Yunus, 2007).

Yunus (2007) describes the key characteristics of a successful social business organization. The following seven attributes are particularly relevant to this study: *innovation, revolution, objectivity, empowerment, commodity, self-employment, and sustainability*. *Innovation* reflects the business' belief that people with a difference and lower economical status are worthy and credible of financial investment. *Revolution* describes the option of financial capital provided through alternative means other than regular banking and interest rates. Investors and owners practice the principle of eventually regaining the invested money but they do not take any dividend past that point. *Objectivity* refers to a practice of financially supporting a group of people who would not receive this financial capital through the regular banking system. The impact of the business is reflected in the success of the employees and their environment, not in the amount of financial profit. *Empowerment* is created in borrowers. The employees work towards covering the costs of the business and generating revenue. *Commodity* is acquired with enhanced integration and social capital among business employees. Social goals may also be a part of the business design. *Self-employment* provides self-determination and creation of income-generated work. Finally, *sustainability* of the business defines it as a successful business enterprise. Just like other businesses, social

enterprises must measure up to the regular demands of the business market, to last and carry longevity (Yunus, 2010).

In general, a traditional business is defined as a profit making enterprise with the core goal being to maximize revenue. Traditional economics dictates that people are devoted to personal profit and gain. However, it has been realized that this is not the entire view of human nature. Along with profit driven goals, some people are also motivated to assist people in need and to improve social conditions. Weber (2008) claims that today's capitalism standing alone omits this second drive that some people possess and provides no opportunity for it to be expressed. "A social business differs from a charity [because] the charity dollar is spent once and then it is gone... the social business dollar can be endlessly recycled" (Weber, 2008, p. 2). Weber describes social business not as a theory but as a "practical reality" (p. 3) and claims that many people will be eager to lend financially to social businesses just as they are willing to donate to charity.

Social economy businesses balance the element of social objectives for an organization with economic objectives. As with private business competing in the marketplace, a social business carries the pressure to be competitive. A distinction between the for-profit business and the social business is that capital gain "does not dominate over the social objectives in the organization's decision-making" (Quarter et al, 2009, p. 43). Thus, a social business is operated to generate revenue to provide profit but the business is run in a way so that people matter (Yunus, 2010). The promotion of community networking, relationship building and togetherness are key criteria for social capital (Condeluci, 2002). What is described as social capital by Condeluci is the

essential accomplishment of social business in conjunction with the acquisition of the financial capital.

Self-employment and self-directed work appear to be viable choices of work activity for persons with a DD. Creating and fulfilling a business plan, establishing community contacts and managing the necessary finances are all crucial aspects to the success of the business partners. This success is transferred into the perception of other people who then start believing in the competency of a person with a DD as a successful business partner (Community Living Research Project, 2006). Social businesses such as worker cooperatives develop new labour circumstances for persons with a DD. They also move social perception “away from the model of sheltered workshop employment and advances toward a workplace characterized by self-determination” (Community Living Research Project, 2006, p. 45). To employ other workers who do not have a DD creates an inclusive work site by hiring support staff who are interested in joining a cooperative type of workplace and carry a positive attitude towards persons with a DD (Community Living Research Project, 2006, p. 45).

A Social Purpose Enterprise for Persons with DD

Common Ground Cooperative is a SPE that claims success as an employment opportunity for persons with a DD. The business was initially funded by a government grant, organized by family support and operated by a number of persons with a DD who turned their hopes for a catering service into a reality. As the business expanded and increased its list of community customers, the workers in the business decided to become legal partners. In the two year span between 2000 and 2002, the business was generating up to \$3,000.00 CAN per month. Each partner was receiving income support from the

government along with a small income from the business revenue. The support staff members were paid by the funds from government grants (Lemon & Lemon, 2003). The partners of this business have been working, learning, and personally developing as a collective. The support of the community interest in their product, financial investment of stakeholders who believed in their competency and the volunteers, such as drivers, as well as government funded support staff, have all contributed to the functioning of this business. People who are interested in becoming partners in the enterprises associated with Common Ground Cooperative must participate in the organization's nine month "Foundations Program." This program, funded by the Ministry of Community and Social Services, provides training in basic work skills and work ethic required to hold employment. The last three months of the Foundations Program consists of a co-op placement at one of the enterprises supported by Common Ground Cooperative. At the end of this period the existing partners in the enterprise vote to determine whether the co-op participant will be offered a position as a full partner in the business. With business decisions in the hands of the partners, they "are beginning to redefine their workplace world for themselves and to make it their own" (Lemon & Lemon, 2003, p. 424). Thus, CGC represents a valid model of self-employment for persons with a DD.

Common Ground Cooperative possesses key resources to ensure that the business runs. These resources come from the community such as Community Living Toronto, networking with community customers, churches, and other organizations. All of these are considered members of the business.

Our members bring to the common table valuable knowledge,
resources, and experience gained in business, schools, political parties,

social work and elsewhere. They share a powerful vision of equity and fairness that is unleashed when members and adherents of many historic institutions bring their collective wisdom to bear on the economic woes that face us. (Lemon & Lemon, 2003, p. 424).

Lemon and Lemon (2003) describe the collaboration of community involvement as independence enhanced by interdependence. This option of self-employment is a combination of an exclusive workplace, since all partners have a DD, and an inclusive work setting, since their work connects to the community. It fulfills the opportunity for self-determination as these partners are directive and dedicated to the operation of the business. The focus of this study was to examine the impact of three CGC related social purpose enterprises on the employment experiences of the business partners and their sense of social inclusion. The question being asked was whether the mix of segregated and integrated settings effectively contributes to a feeling of inclusive employment?

Social Inclusion

As we examine the lives of persons with a DD, it is clearly acknowledged that this population has been socially excluded and for decades human services have struggled to effectively implement social policy to promote inclusion. For the purpose of this study at CGC, the definition of inclusion was based on Hall's (2010) examination of traditional elements of inclusion and his conception of "belonging". From Hall's perspective, when considering the development and promotion of social inclusion, people are required to conceptualize approaches that will improve the lives and mainstreaming of persons with a DD. The emphasis of supports for persons with a DD needs to be situated in spaces and relationships which nurture belonging and quality of life. Identified causes of social

exclusion include lack of employment opportunities and social structures that harbour the marginalisation of persons with a DD. Ultimately, the absence of personal choice in their daily lives is acknowledged as both the creator and the outcome of social exclusion (Hall, 2010).

The social perceptions of exclusion and inclusion define the social structure of the community determining who is within (included and valued) and who is outside (excluded and devalued). When reviewing the historical path of persons with a DD and their lack of employment opportunities, exclusion has been prevalent (Hall, 2010). The Department of Health (2001) stated that social inclusion depends upon the four traditional principles of personal choice, control, rights and independence. These principles can be established with the provision of increased options in paid employment for people with a DD. These four principles were the foundation of the present study's examination of the partners' perception of their work. Access to mainstream work activity may constitute regular levels of participation in the community but integration of employment activity does not resolve marginalization of persons with a DD within the work force (Hall, 2010). Physical inclusion does not resolve social exclusion (Hall, 2005).

It is crucial to recognize that a person with a DD who successfully acquires paid employment is not guaranteed a sense of belonging. Although having paid employment represents physical and financial inclusion, it does not address the social exclusion issues automatically (Hall, 2010). Therefore, there seems to be a significant gap between physical integration and social inclusion. According to Hall's approach, people with a DD need to establish their own spaces of inclusion, places where they define themselves, not places created and defined for them by others. This sense of authentic inclusion was

the focus of this study through an examination of whether the CGC partners' sense of belonging had been achieved within the framework of their social purpose enterprise and its' community connectedness. To achieve inclusion, according to Hall (2010), is to feel you belong, feel attached, feel valued and have a sense of "insiderness", all of which resides in proximity to other people, places and social events. The focus of this study was to examine CGC as an SPE and examine its level of social inclusion in the context of Hall's definition of "insiderness" and the Department of Health's (2001) four traditional principles being rights, independence, personal choice, and personal control that guide social inclusion development and enhancement.

Four Traditional Principles to Guide the Process of Social Inclusion

Rights. The principle of rights was considered present if the interview questions elicited responses that indicate that the CGC partner was aware of their rights in the workplace and expressed the ability to exercise those rights (The Council of Quality and Leadership, 2005). Workers' rights were considered in place if the workplace offered a grievance process to negotiate complaints or where there was a format in place to ensure that partners were heard (The Council of Quality and Leadership, 2005).

Independence. The principle of independence was considered present if interview questions elicited responses that indicated partners were actively supported to do things for themselves rather than by job coaches.

Personal choice. The principle of choice was considered present when interview questions elicited responses that demonstrated self-determination indicating that the partners determined their preferences within the work setting. Indicators included partners participating in staff meetings, describing individual work goals, and evidence of

CGC operating as a person-focused employment (The Council of Quality and Leadership, 2005). Personal choice was reflected in the description of CGC responding to partners' ideas as well as offering a process for complaints.

Personal control. The principle of control will be considered present when interview questions elicit responses indicating that partners are actively encouraged to participate and assist with the business (Hall, 2010). This would be reflected in partners having autonomy to make decisions that affect their work situation and direct their own business development (The Council of Quality and Leadership, 2005). Personal control may also be considered present if partners describe leadership skills and are supported taking on leadership roles.

The aim of the partner interviews and data collection was to address the following two research questions: First, did the partners describe the operations of CGC (and their specific work site) in reference to the four principles of social inclusion (Department of Health, 2001)? These four traditional principles, as defined above, were rights, independence, personal choice and personal control. These principles were explored by examining how the partners described the nature of their work as well as how the partners described their decision making role in the organization. The second research question was whether the partners described their work in terms of Hall's (2010) definition of social inclusion, characterizing a sense of "insiderness" and belonging. This definition was explored by examining the experiences of the partners in terms of feeling attached to their workplace, feeling valued and feeling connected to the community that uses their services.

Three Indicators of Social Inclusion and “Insiderness”

Attachment to the work environment. This aspect of social inclusion was considered present when interview questions elicited responses that included partners feeling safe and secure within their work environment (The Council of Quality and Leadership, 2005). Other references were considered in the partners’ description of feeling “bonded” to other people at the work site, feeling a sense of acceptance with an essence of group-belonging and feeling included (Hall, 2010).

Valued. The aspect of social inclusion of feeling valued was considered present when interview questions elicited responses that included partners feeling they had a positive image/reputation in the larger community. This aspect was also reflected in the partners’ description of being encouraged by the workplace to pursue their dreams and view their work as meaningful (The Council of Quality and Leadership, 2005). A crucial element of the aspect of feeling valued was considered present when reflected in the partners’ description of being treated with respect. According to the Council of Quality and Leadership (2005) “respect is more than the absence of negative comments or actions. Respect is demonstrated in how we interact with people. Interactions that promote respect do not draw undue attention to a person’s disability or difference”(p. 11).

Connected to the community. The aspect of social inclusion of connectedness was considered present when interview questions elicited responses that reflected partners expressing connections to other people demonstrating social networking and seeing themselves as part of a larger community (Hall, 2010). The partners may describe community contacts and community resources such as transportation or skills training. During the interview, this aspect will be considered present if partners express their work

as authentic rather than simulated, describe their worksite in the community rather than segregated and relate a sense of engagement with their customers (The Council of Quality and Leadership, 2005).

Researcher's Perspective

It is important that I acknowledge the researcher perspective I brought into this study. I have worked in the field of human service for persons with a DD for more than 30 years. The employment history of persons with a DD described earlier in this present study is a history I have witnessed to some degree. I foresaw two main areas of potential influence I needed to acknowledge. First, I carried a personal belief into the study that, prior to meeting the partners, contained the notion that any “program” set up to provide services for people with a DD tend to look beneficial on paper but truly are not authentic in practice. Thus, coming into the study I did carry the belief that this model of employment would be exposed as another segregated form of community activity for persons with a DD. I did not believe that I would see this employment model as one that manifested true social inclusion.

My second perspective was to enter the study environment with an open mind and not bring in personal judgements and opinions from my years of experience in the field. The study was not an evaluative study. I felt confident that I established an empathic eye and ear with continuous self reminders and regular reviews of my journal. My experience was used as an advantage for the interviews because I recognized missing information or noticed quiet nuances within interview responses. Since my formative years of work have entailed residential services and not included the area of employment, I also entered this

study with a certain level of newness. I was eager to meet the partners of CGC and learn all that I could from them as they shared their business experiences.

Methodology

Purpose of the Study

This study was part of a larger research project funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Community-University Research Alliances (CURA) program. The larger Social Business for Marginalized Social Groups CURA project included case studies of fourteen social businesses including the CGC case study. The present study was part of the CGC case study and was designed to investigate the specific nature of the three SPE Coffee Sheds supported by CGC and to explore the partners' description of their involvement and participation with these three CGC supported businesses. The perceptions and opinions of the partners regarding their work at the Coffee Sheds were examined using semi-structured interviews. Responses to the interview questions were referenced to the four traditional principles of social inclusion and to Hall's (2010) three criteria for "insiderness" and belonging.

Research Design

In this study, a descriptive case analysis approach was used. This method of study was used to describe the concept of partnership in the context of three related social businesses. The qualitative and applied research approach (Quinn Patton, 2002; Baxter & Jack, 2008) of this study focused on gaining insight into the experience of CGC partners through the implementation of a triangulation of interview settings in different but related businesses associated with CGC. Initially started by government grants and parents' initiative, the Coffee Sheds are owned and operated by adults with a DD who are partners

in the businesses and who receive job coach and administrative support from employees of CGC. The focus of the study was to examine the perceptions of the partners in these business environments which are a form of socially inclusive work placement for persons with DD. The researcher focused on the partners' described experiences to illuminate the real-life context of a social business. The partners provided the key information and were the direct source to address the research questions (Maxwell, 2008).

Participants

The partners of the three CGC related social businesses were selected as valued representatives of the context of this study. All partners in the CGC related food service businesses were invited to participate. Fifteen partners volunteered to participate and were interviewed as part of the larger CGC case study and represented the data corpus. A data subset of six of these interviews was included in the present study (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The partners were persons with a DD and owners of the businesses with which they were affiliated. The total number of partners interviewed represented 20% of the CGC partners. All participation in the study was on a volunteer basis with full disclosure of participant involvement including clear acknowledgment that they could discontinue their involvement at any point in the study without repercussions (see Appendix C for letter of Recruitment Notice). At the start of each interview, the participants were given a copy of the consent form and the researcher used a second copy to read to the participant, answer any questions raised by participants and obtain the participants' signature. Informed participant consent was obtained for thirteen partners prior to any study involvement. Informed consent was determined by the researcher and the research assistant who described the interviewing procedure to participants and

vigilantly ensured that the participants displayed a clear understanding of each element in the consents as demonstrated by answering the consent comprehension question (see Appendix E). The two participants whose consent could not be obtained, and whose data were not included in the study, were unable to answer these comprehension questions with sufficient accuracy to assure the researcher and research assistant that they understood the consent content. Each participant was given the choice of whether to have their job coach present during the consent and interview process. Two partners choose to have their job coach present for the consent and interview stages. All partners who expressed an interest in the study were interviewed to provide a sense of respect and value to each partner wanting to be involved in the study. Also, all fifteen interviews were conducted with the understanding that this study was part of a larger project where these data collection could be useful. However, the interviews for the two volunteers who did not achieve informed consent were not recorded.

Demographic information was collected for participants including their name, age, previous employment experiences, gender, organizational affiliation, and their role in relation to CGC and its business (see Appendix A for complete demographic form). All participant information gathered for the purpose of the study was kept confidential and secured in a locked cabinet at Brock University.

Recruitment

Recruitment was initiated by a letter of invitation (see Appendix C) sent by the Executive Director of CGC to all partners of CGC related businesses. The potential partner participants informed their job coach or the Executive Director of their interest in participating in the study. The Executive Director or the job coach contacted the

researcher by email to arrange the interviews. Meetings involving the researcher with potential partner interviewees were organized with the assistance of job coaches.

Consents were signed at the start of each interview in the presence of the researcher and one research assistant who were both present at each interview with the partners. All interviews were conducted by the researcher in person. No interviews were conducted by phone. Written consent (see Appendix E for complete consent form) was obtained prior to any interviews and oral consent was obtained on audiotape at the start of each interview. The researcher and research assistant had no prior personal relationship with CGC or the partners.

Recruitment worksite locations. Common Ground Cooperative supports five businesses; three Coffee Sheds, Lemon and Allspice Cookery and a newly developed housekeeping business called CleanABLE. At the time of this study, letters of invitation to participate in the study were distributed to the three Coffee Sheds and the Cookery because these were the four food services. The partners in the fifth SPE, CleanABLE, were not sent letters of invitation because it was not recognized as a well-established business yet as well as providing a different type of community service outside of the food service profession and the partners worked for limited time periods. All interested persons from the four food service SPE received an interview.

Four interviews were not included in the data collection for this study due to lack of consent obtained and to eliminate interviews potentially influenced by job coach presence. Two people requested the presence of their job coach for their interview process. Two other people did not complete the consent form process because they were unable to answer the consent comprehension questions adequately to ensure fully

informed consent. They were interviewed out of respect for their interest and time volunteered but their data could not be included in the study.

Qualitative studies generally rely on data collection from various sources of information and uphold the principle of triangulation (Maxwell, 2008). This study used triangulation in the data collection from three similarly oriented worksites. This strategy reduced the risk that the study's conclusions would merely reflect systematic contextual biases and/or methodological limitations from one location (Maxwell, 2008).

Sample selection. Six partners of the total fifteen interviewed were used for the data analysis in this study. The order of interviewing each partner was randomly arranged according to the order of received acceptance to participate and available date and time to meet with the researcher. The researcher first received interest from four partners from one of the Coffee Sheds and a fifth partner decided to volunteer to participate on the day the interviews were being completed. The next group of partners to express an interest in being interviewed came from four people in the Cookery.

Three interviews of partners from another Coffee Shed were completed. Finally, the last group of partners to express an interest in participation in this study came from the third Coffee Shed. Two partners requested interviews at this worksite prior to the scheduled interview day and a third volunteered to participate on the day the scheduled interviews took place.

At the start of each interview all fifteen partners received a five dollar Tim Horton's debit card as an expression of gratitude for their time and participation. The Tim Horton's card was given to the partner regardless of consent and/or interview completion.

Inclusion criteria. The criteria used for inclusion in the present study was to analyse the data from the first two interviews conducted at each of the three Coffee Sheds for partners who completed their informed consent process and who did not have the support of a job coach during the interview. Interviews of partners from the Lemon and Allspice Cookery were not included because this work location and its work duties were distinct and different in nature from the three Coffee Sheds. All interviews took place in a private meeting room.

Final participant sample. Data from six participants (five females and one male) were included in the present study. The range of age in the participant group was from twenty-three to forty-eight years of age. The participating partners worked between one and three days per week. They had been working for a Coffee Shed between one and eight years. For the purpose of reporting the results while maintaining confidentiality, each participant was randomly assigned a unique identifier such as P1 for number one.

Three Worksite Locations

The three Coffee Sheds provided similar retail food services but in locations with varying degrees of public access in Toronto. One Coffee Shed was situated inside a highly used university building by a main entrance and a large lounge area. The business operated between 9:00 A.M. and 3:00 P.M. during the week. Partners worked either a morning shift or an afternoon shift. There appeared to be two partners working per shift. The business had a counter space set up with a coffee dispenser, tea and hot chocolate with a hot water dispenser. The counter space and refrigerator also provided ready-to-eat foods such as sandwiches, snacks and cold drinks with condiments available. The majority of food items were products of the Lemon and Allspice Cookery. The location

of this Coffee Shed was evident of an environment that was very active with community people.

Another Coffee Shed was located in the basement of a social services building situated on a street of mainly industrial-looking buildings. To enter the building there was a wheelchair accessible mechanism to open the door. Inside the building there were offices and administrative-type cubicles. People entering the building were asked to sign in as visitors. The Coffee Shed business was located on the lower floor area, presenting an approximate twelve by twelve foot room which was adjacent to a small lunchroom area. The location of this Coffee Shed promoted an environment that was quiet and segregated from the larger community.

A third business site was situated in a social service building downtown. It was an older and well maintained brick building. The atmosphere of this building was friendly and inviting. The building hosted services for children and adults with disabilities. The Coffee Shed was located about twenty feet from the main entrance. The business area was quite small but adequate for their needs. The location of this Coffee Shed created an environment that was active with agency employees and community people receiving services.

Data Collection

The aim of this research study was to gather data that described the beliefs and viewpoints of the partners who were involved in the three Coffee Shed businesses. The method of collection included semi-structured interview questions (see Appendix B for complete list of interview questions). The source of data collection was used to acquire a

purposeful homogeneous sample (Quinn Patton, 2002; Baxter & Jack, 2008) focused on people who had a DD and who were CGC partners in a retail food service business.

Semi-structured interviews. The researcher used semi-structured interviews which had pre-set questions but allowed scope for probes to encourage detailed responding (see Appendix D for interview questions rationale). All of the semi-structured interview questions were re-stated or re-worded to establish the level of comprehension necessary for each partner who was interviewed such as “What rights are you able to exercise at the Coffee Shed?” was changed to “What choices are you allowed or not allowed to make at the Coffee Shed?” Notes were taken during the interviews which were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim by a research assistant to allow the opportunity for the use of in depth analysis and inclusion of direct quotations in the study’s results. Interviews lasted approximately one hour per participant.

The interview questions were developed and used for the purpose of collecting data related to the four traditional principles of social inclusion and Hall’s (2010) three criteria for “insiderness” and belonging (see Appendix D). Each interview question was formulated to potentially elicit responses related to at least one, but in many cases more than one, principle and/or criterion.

Data Analysis

Descriptive thematic analysis. Thematic analysis was used as a search for patterns and developing themes through transcript reading and re-reading (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006). The primary units of analysis were within and between case analyses of interviews. Descriptive analysis of content and themes, focused on the four principles of the traditional interpretation of social inclusion and the three criteria of

“insiderness” set out by Hall (2010). NVivo computerized software was used to assist with the organization of the coding categories and the prominent and overlapping themes (Boyatzis, 1998). The method of the study and its analysis involved an inductive as well as deductive framework (Quinn Patton, 2002). The inductive analysis was present in the breakdown and disclosure of interview responses that revealed patterns and/or themes expected or not expected and were open to fresh interpretation (Boyatzis, 1998). The deductive analysis occurred with the processing of interview responses placed in the theoretically driven social inclusion principles of rights, independence, personal choice and personal control as well as the three “insiderness” criteria of feeling attached, connected and valued. The benefit of this mixed framework was reflected in the findings reported to provide a greater understanding of the benefits of SPE as well as other unexpected and notably informative findings. Findings were postulated based on interpretation of the data and these interpretations were demonstrated by inclusion of quotations from the raw data (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006).

A unique case orientation (Quinn Patton, 2002) was used. The analysis looked for unique, shared and contrasting patterns and themes within cases and amongst the participants in reference to the traditional social inclusion principles and Hall’s (2010) three aspects of “insiderness” (see Appendix D for rationale for interview questions). A holistic perspective (Quinn Patton, 2002) illustrated the interdependence and system dynamics of the social purpose enterprise and its complexity as a social function combined with economic provision for persons with a DD. The research goal was to obtain an understanding of what the partners valued and the meaning they attached to the SPE from their personal perspectives which was then referenced to multiple concepts

existing in complex relationships of social inclusion paradigm (Corbin and Strauss, 2008).

Responses to the interview questions composed the data set. There were two treatments of the data set. The first level of examination was the completion of a within-case analysis. Each of the twenty-three interview questions were examined individually within cases for the partners' responses to each question. Responses were coded deductively as they related to the research question and inductively as they related to all new ideas (Corbin and Strauss, 2008). For example, the interview question "Can you tell me about some of your experiences with customers?" was a question that was designed to probe for and deductively provide information regarding social interaction of partners with the larger community (Corbin and Strauss, 2008). However, this interview question also inductively provided information about the work ethic of the partners and their perceptions of customer service. Deductive patterns were identified that related to the traditional principles of inclusion and to Hall's (2010) criteria for "insiderness". Any other patterns were distinguished as emergent or inductive themes (Boyatzis, 1998). The second level of study was a cross-case analysis. Each partners' responses were examined individually by question in comparison to the other partners' responses to the same individual question. Again, themes and patterns for the partners were noted and related to the research questions as well as addressing any emergent themes (Corbin and Strauss, 2008). Additionally, a within-worksite comparison of responses to individual questions was completed and then an across-worksite comparison was explored from the within worksite overall analysis.

Phase one: Transcription. Each interview was coded as “P” for participant with a number to identify the order of interviews and “WS” for worksite with a number to identify the Coffee Shed location. For example, the first participant to be interviewed at worksite 1 Coffee Shed was coded as “P1WS1”. Worksite 2 was the Lemon and Allspice Cookery which was not used in this study. Worksite 3 Coffee Shed was coded as “WS3” and worksite 4 Coffee Shed as “WS4”. Each interview was transcribed verbatim with all personal identifiers omitted by the research assistant. The transcription was completed manually from the audio-taped interviews. The transcriptions were then read by the researcher.

As the researcher read the transcript for the first read, key words in all responses to the interview questions were highlighted in the colour yellow to represent the main idea(s) expressed in each response. As the researcher read the transcript for a second read, the four traditional principles of social inclusion and Hall’s (2010) criteria for “insiderness” were highlighted in the participants’ responses with each principle and criteria represented by a different highlighted colour. This first phase of analysis organized the data into meaningful groups (Braun and Clarke, 2006). For example, any responses by the participant that reflected “rights” were highlighted in pink, any responses that reflected “attached” were highlighted in orange, and so on. Some responses had several coded colours for the one response. This first phase was a within case, within cohort deductive analysis. Analysis of the text was guided by the preliminary codes of social inclusion categories (Fereday and Muir-Cochrane, 2006). Once all four principles and three criteria were highlighted within the semi-structured interview

responses, all remaining responses that did not receive a highlighted code colour were logged as inductive themes (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

The goal of the coding process was not to produce frequencies but to separate the data and rearrange them into sections that facilitated comparison between patterns or themes in the same section as well as between sections (Maxwell, 2008). Broad codes represented organizational categories that functioned as sections for future sorting and sub-coding for detailed analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Once all coding was completed for the interview responses, a summary chart was composed for the worksite and its two participants. The chart included a within case deductive summary, an across case but within worksite deductive and inductive summary, and overall overlapping and dominant themes.

Phase two: NVivo. All six transcriptions of the semi-structured interviews were transferred to the NVivo computer software. An across case, across worksite analysis was explored. Each question in the interviews was coded to create a main node. Categories were created through this coding process and included description of the participants' ideas and beliefs (Maxwell, 2008). For example, interview question number two (see Appendix B for complete list of interview questions) was coded as "work before". All responses by the six participants for this question were transferred to this node. Once one participant's interview responses were coded, the researcher took a break before starting the next participant's coding, to limit fatigue and potential errors (Boyatzis, 1998).

Phase Three: NVivo tree nodes. Each main node was read and reviewed for any similar or contrasting themes and any emergent themes. Tree nodes were created to transfer these themes into. For example, interview question number two was coded as

“work before”. The tree nodes created under this main node included “type of work” and “community work”. This phase in the analysis provided a detailed deductive across case analysis.

Phase Four: Emergent themes. At this phase, overlapping themes that ran across numerous participants were logged into new nodes as inductive themes. For example, statements regarding the importance of professional work practices and habits were repeatedly made. These responses were coded under the reference of “work ethic”.

Phase Five: Overall analysis summary and research inquiry. Examination of similarities and differences within and across settings and participants, and general patterns and themes in the data were identified (Fereday and Muir-Cochranre, 2006). This phase assisted in providing a rich description of the entire data set and gave a sense of the predominant and important themes (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

Results

Deductive themes that related to the research questions and inductive themes that emerged from the data are reviewed in this results section. The major deductive themes that were examined from the interview questions included the description of the job, prior job experiences, employment goals and satisfaction, business ownership and authority, business success, rights and respect, and business advice. The inductive themes that emerged from the data revealed such topics as the nature of partnership, relationships, work ethic, teamwork and the notion of “work”.

Partners’ Description of Their Job

The partners reported detailed information about the nature of their current job and how was it related to job duties and tasks. Their descriptions of their work included

their perception of their job class, how they obtained the position, and their reason for choosing the job. The partners differentiated their job class from a volunteer position, explained the apprenticeship process that prepared them for their job, the duties and tasks learned on the job and their role as a teacher for new partners.

Job status. The partners of the three Coffee Sheds clearly viewed their position at the SPE as either full time or part time and definitely not volunteer work. The partners' confirmation for this description of their job status was explained in terms of monetary gain: "The difference is we get paid but at volunteer work you don't get paid" (P3) and in terms of hours worked: "Well it's part time I should say because I sometimes work like two day or three day so it's part time" (P4).

Job acquisition. The partners described learning about the existence of the SPE through their high school co-op program, a friend, or support worker. "I just first I started out as a client here and I had a friend from college and he was working at the Coffee Shed and he told me about the Coffee Shed" (P3). Some partners discussed attending a training course in preparation for the job. "I got this job from a program that I took, that is run to Common Ground..." (P1). Some partners discussed having had an interview and participating in an apprenticeship and job probation process prior to becoming an eligible partner. "Um, it started off with an interview, from uh, from uh, staff who worked at Common Grounds" (P6). Some partners also described changing jobs from one Coffee Shed to another Coffee Shed.

Job choice. The partners choose to work at a SPE Coffee Shed for reasons including social enhancement, to gain new experiences, and job proximity to their home. One partner described the motivation "... to meet friends, to maybe try something new, to

try and get out of the house and try something new” (P6). For another, geography and novelty were factors. “It’s closer to my home and it’s a Coffee Shed place. It’s a good change. It’s a good change. Different jobs. It’s a Coffee Shed. It’s a good change. I love it” (P5). One partner described the partners’ voting process as having an impact on the determination of their work location. “I did try for another Coffee Shed, but they didn’t select me as a partner” (P2).

Job duties. The partners described specific job duties and routines that were important to the operation of the SPE. These duties were discussed as including putting the business sign out to advertise that their Coffee Shed was open for business, getting keys to open the Coffee Shed, putting cash in the register, washing their hands, checking expiry dates on their food items, boiling water, making coffee, setting up the counters with ready-to-eat food items and condiments, washing the counters and banking at the end of the day. Some partners explained how they would set up beverages and food items on a cart and sell their product to people in their offices within the building. “We have a cart that we take ... because not everyone is able to leave their office... so we make it convenient for them” (P3).

Learning on the job. The partners described the various job duties they were required to learn as well as other related skills. “I’ve learned how to count the money from cash. Yep. And what we do is count the money and we subtract fifty dollars and we put the money in a pouch and some of us take it to the bank” (P5). The partners reported learning necessary means of transportation, teamwork, work ethic, and described how they gained independence. “I take the TTC. ... I took the TTC awareness program” (P1).

The partners spoke of their acquisition of interpersonal skills and professionalism on the job. Some of these interpersonal skills were quite routine and daily occurrences such as “I learned how to talk to customers and how to count the money and how to make coffee” (P4). Others were more socially complex and potentially stressful situations that required nuanced responses: “Working with other people. It’s not easy. It’s not always easy. [The partner described a difficult situation with a partner where] she was cross and I told her I’m sorry. I didn’t know you were coming back that way and I had to calm her down” (P2).

Teaching on the job. Regarding teaching their learned skills to new partners, the participants described teaching new partners the job duties, work rules and professionalism that they had to learn when becoming a new partner. These descriptions included the mechanics of the job focused on the specific tasks to be mastered, “We train them to do the coffee, how to do the cart run, how to do the floats, things like that” (P3) to the nature of how to impart these skills.

One partner’s description of the mentoring aspect of teaching by providing support for new partners reflected an awareness of the teaching process with sensitivity to individual needs and the teaching strategies that are effective. “Help people remember what to do and ‘cause not everyone has good memory of where stuff belongs... remember to guide people and sometimes I’ll just point to the container or where the stuff is” (P6). The seasoned partner viewed the new partner or apprentice as a learner and fulfilled the mechanical and psychological roles of an effective teacher.

The described nature of the job. In summary, a partner’s position at a Coffee Shed was described as paid full-time or part-time job in terms of status. Partners were

exposed to the opportunity to apply for partnership status and to be involved in the business experience through a high school program, a social connection or support staff. Their choice of working at a Coffee Shed was made based on anticipation of the personal gain of social interaction and new experiences, as well as geographic and travel factors. Specific job tasks required to run the business were learned and carried out by the partners and task knowledge was passed onto new partners by a process of partner mentorship and training.

Partners' Prior Job Experiences and History

Partners were asked to describe what jobs they had held prior to working for the Coffee Shed. Mainstream employment was reported and challenges with maintaining such employment were revealed.

Competitive employment and community jobs. The partners described having held numerous community jobs prior to working at the SPE Coffee Shed. These community jobs included working in restaurants, cleaning services, department stores, volunteering and tutoring. The partners spoke of hardships they had experienced in keeping some of these jobs. One partner described a difficulty with their community job and “said to the manager is there something else I can do besides that [job position]... and she said to be honest with you we have nothing here for you to do and if you can’t handle what you’re doing the best bet... I think it’s better if you leave” (P3).

Other partners remarked on experiences with bosses or supervisors in past employment that reflected the partners’ feelings of being devalued or disrespected. One partner described being dismissed because of taking time to do a job carefully. “I didn’t like the way my boss was treating me because he see me taking my time... I didn’t want

to make a mistake... and he said well, sorry to tell you this but I'm going to have to let you go" (P3). Partners contrasted the nature of the Coffee Shed with the demands they had experienced in past competitive employment that included performance pressures being exerted by supervisors. "I like the Coffee Shed better [than my past employment where], there's too many people trying to be the boss and try tell you to do that over. Here [the Coffee Shed] is peaceful, quiet like nobody try well they still tell you what to do but not as much as over there" (P4).

Employability and job expectations of mainstream employer. Each partner reported having experienced difficulty maintaining employment in the competitive sector for a variety of reasons and found the work environment of the Coffee Shed to be more respectful and suitable. Thus, partners described their job at the Coffee Shed as being more conducive to workplace compatibility than their past employment in an integrated setting.

Job Goals and Dreams

Interview questions probed the partners for their personal goals in their current job as well as future goals for their career and employment. The partners were asked what job would be their ideal.

The partners reported being content with their job at the Coffee Shed and did not express any need to leave this job. They described it as an opportunity: "I'm so scared we will lose the place (the Coffee Shed) sometimes" (P5). At the same time, the partners still spoke of the desire to work at other community jobs in the future. The partners expressed their appreciation for the business experience and also held the goal of achieving other

careers such as working with children, animals, and in the theatre. “I’m not going to stay here because I want to get another job. I want an office job” (P3).

Dream job. The partners described their dream job. These descriptions included working for the school board, for a restaurant as a chef or dishwasher, for the theatre, as a life guard, and for a well known communication service. However, none of the partners gave the impression that they felt stuck in the current job placement. Each partner expressed a feeling of satisfaction with their position at the Coffee Shed and they were not currently looking for other employment. They also expressed the desire to move onto a job in the mainstream sector in the future. The partners felt their dream job goals were attainable and achievable.

Job Income

The partners were interviewed about their income earned from the business and the financial assistance they received from their government disability. They described the restrictions that the government pension has on their business earnings. Earnings at the Coffee Shed were unfavourably compared with earnings that are possible in comparable employment in the mainstream sector.

Ontario disabilities support program (ODSP). The partners all received monthly income from ODSP and their SPE Coffee Shed earnings provided additional income. The limitation to additional income that was allowed without penalty when receiving ODSP was discussed by a number of the partners: “But at the same time you have to [be] careful how much you make because if they see how much you make... if it’s more than what you[‘re] supposed to have, you’re not careful, they might take you off ODSP so our company has to be careful” (P3).

Another partner reflected some of the conflict inherent in being dependent on a disability pension and the social perception that can accompany it. “The main reason why we start this business is because we are showing the government just because we have a disability doesn’t mean you can’t work like everybody else” (P3).

Income satisfaction. The partners described their level of income as being fair for the job they were doing and that they were satisfied with the amount. They also expressed a desire to make a higher income but felt limited by the ODSP restrictions. “So yeah, it’s not a matter of the company doesn’t want to give more money. It’s just if they give more plus you get ODSP...” (P3). It was recognized that their income did not compare to wages earned in the competitive employment sector. “It is as fair as the Coffee Shed is concerned, but it doesn’t measure up to the real world” (P2).

Overall, income was noted as being important and their interest in a higher income was reported. Ontario Disability Support Program limitations affected the partners’ perception of freedom to prosper financially from the Coffee Shed business. The partners did not describe their income as equivalent but as less income in comparison to mainstream employment of the same job type.

Job Satisfaction

The partners discussed what aspects of their job at the Coffee Shed were desirable and/or beneficial and what aspects were not. The aspects discussed included specific tasks on the job, learning new duties, developing social contacts, having authority, and providing customer service. The partners described the job as having a positive impact on their life and well-being.

What partners liked about their job. The partners described specific job duties that they liked to do. They spoke of being the boss, being a team leader and teamwork in general. Partners expressed pride in learning specific tasks related to their job. “Being out at work, um learning new things, like those things you haven’t learned yet. For an example, I learned how to do an invoice” (P6). Another partner described enjoyment associated with some tasks. “Um, the cash register and I love doing the pots. It keeps my mind off things. It’s better than you know getting up and doing the carts” (P5).

The partners valued getting paid and also valued co-worker friendships. They also discussed their enjoyment of working with their job coach and with customers. “I love getting paid, I love hanging out with my friends, I always work together” (P1). Valuing the social connection with customers was also described:

“The customers... sometimes you feel down or whatever and you have to work... and focus on work, I don’t know the customer just comes and says something and they just make you smile” (P3).

The partners’ remarks suggested their feelings for positive self-esteem and empowerment related to their job at the Coffee Shed. “Being my own boss is actually pretty good... I don’t know maybe because just certain decisions we can make” (P3).

What partners dislike about the job. The partners did not express substantial dislike about their work or business as evidenced by comments such as “I don’t know if I dislike much” (P6). Some partners spoke of a dislike for dealing with a difficult or rude customer but also discussed strategies to deal with the situation:

“Well as I said sometimes you can get a rude person and you try to calm down the person to talk to them and like customers is right but sometimes

they try to push you over the edge but I don't really say anything. I just move away from them. I get the other partner to deal with that person" (P1).

Another dislike mentioned was when the Coffee Shed was busy and there were numerous customers to serve at once. "I got to do one thing at a time, so many customers and trying to focus on one customer and then the other ones" (P1).

Difference the job has made in their life. The partners described the fact that they now had to get up in the early morning to go to their job. "You have to wake up early to come to work and you have to be ready to work when you're here" (P6). They spoke of making friendships and their improved well-being. The consistency of a steady job was valued and the harmony of the work environment was preferred as indicated in such comments as "Friends always care about, they're, they're always here for me" (P1).

Thus, in regards to job satisfaction, partners reported the value of learning many new skills, of building social networking, and of an enhanced self-image. All challenges faced on the job were described as being typical for that line of work. The partners reported improved quality of life related to their job.

Business Ownership, Independence and Job or Decision-Making Authority

Partners were asked to name the owner of the Coffee Shed and of CGC. They were also asked to name the boss of the business and who is the decision maker within the business.

Owner of CGC and Coffee Shed. In general the partners were not sure who owned CGC and the partners provided different responses to who "owned" the Coffee Shed. The partners' response to who owned the Coffee Shed included numerous times

naming the partners as a group with such a comments as “its business together” (P6), “the partners own the [business]” (P4) or they named the landlord of the business location, or CGC. When the researcher asked “Who owns Coffee Shed?” one response was “the Common Ground” (P2).

The boss of Coffee Shed. One partner spoke of the CGC and its Executive Director as their boss. Two partners spoke of the job coaches as their boss and three spoke of the partners themselves as being their boss.

Independence and support on the job. The partners described job duties that they had learned to carry out independently as well as tasks for which they received support. “Maybe like some things I might need a few helping but I think I look out good on my own” (P3). Some partners discussed how the job coach supported them with making coffee and running the cash register. Other partners spoke of their job coaches helping them with peer interactions. “If you felt comfortable in talking to the partner you don’t get along with you can try and see why you’re not getting along and if you still couldn’t work it out maybe a job coach” (P6).

Decision-making on the job. The partners described numerous decisions that were made by the job coach. These decisions included whether the business would close due to inclement weather, obtaining vacation time approval, or assigning work duties on shift: “[The job coach] told me I couldn’t ever do cash again ‘cause I made mistake. There were times I did make mistakes on the cash” (P5). It was reported that job coaches would appoint a lead partner to supervise the Coffee Shed while the job coach was off site to purchase supplies for the Coffee Shed. Job coaches were known for addressing inappropriate behaviour or conflict among partners and counselling personal problems in

partners. “Um, well like personal problem like I come here to work and like I said if I get really sad then I talk to my job coach” (P4).

Partners were not aware of how job coaches were hired and stated that they had no decision making authority around the hiring or firing of a job coach. “I don’t have much of a choice. Yeah, [he/she] is your job coach unless you decide you’re going to try for another Coffee Shed” (P2). Strategies for coping with an undesirable job coach were described. “Well, like there’s one I really don’t like but I try to stay away from [him/her]” (P4).

Business ownership, independence and decision-making. Overall, the partners provided varied responses to who owned CGC and the Coffee Shed. There was no consistent response to this interview question. They also provided mixed responses to who was the boss of the business with some partners identifying themselves and others identifying CGC staff. Decision making authority seemed to be determined by the jurisdiction of the decision. Partners tended to make business decisions around products and services while administrative and personnel decisions were seen as being made by CGC support staff.

Success of and Being Part of the Business

This area was explored through the partners’ definition of success and their description of belonging to a business.

Success of the business. The partners considered their business to be successful and one partner defined their success in terms of location. “Yes, since we moved, yes I think it is [successful]. Um, people are getting more catering orders, business is starting to get more money. It makes us want to stay and work” (P6). A second aspect of how the

business location fostered success involved expenses absorbed by the landlord. “To be honest with you if it wasn’t for [name of building] ... we would not be here. It’s amazing the [name of building] allow us to have our business here and they even renovate the building to make a spot for us and the good thing about it is we don’t have to pay rent” (P3).

Success was also defined by the partnership responsibility as reported by one partner with the comment “...like you try to do work on time, try not to be late, to be responsible when you be here...” (P1). Other partners remarked on success in terms of income and improvements in the type of product served: “Yeah, I think it is a great place... the partners and the coffee is organic and we try to make changes” (P5). Success was also noted in terms of choosing partners for the business who are going to compliment this success by “get[ting] the right people I guess” (P4).

Being a part of Coffee Shed or the business. The partners described being part of the business in terms of work skills, being involved in teamwork, having a sense of belonging, providing customer service and engaging in decision making “Well in meetings like we basically discuss the stuff that we sell, you know, like should the price be the same or raise the price or stuff like that” (P4).

Being part of the business was characterized by skills such as being organized and contributing to partnership meetings with business ideas or suggestions of to improve the services of the Coffee Shed. This was expressed in such comments as “Basically is that you have to, the customer is the most important person when it comes to the Coffee Shed. When he/she comes into the Coffee Shed, they, the coffee canister always have to be full” (P2).

The partners unanimously spoke of their business and the work involved with pride and enthusiasm. They described a sense of belonging and comfort in terms of being part of a group of people who have disabilities. “To be part of the business you feel like you’re not alone whereas at the other business that I did I felt like I was alone ‘cause I was the only one that had a disability” (P3).

Working together as a team was emphasized as it was stressed that getting along was the key to belonging and succeeding in the business. “I feel like I’m somebody there, like come to work and after when my shift is over at least they try to make me a part as much as I can as comfortable as I can. So whatever they have, they try to get me involved in whatever they have so” (P4).

Overall, the partners viewed their business as a successful enterprise and defined this success in terms of elements including marketing, business policy and revenue.

Rights

The partners briefly discussed their understanding of the concept of their rights. The partners spoke of the right to be safe: “A safe right, say ...it was putting us in harm, we could probably say it. And another safe thing in getting here and being not safe and going to other places” (P6).

The partners felt they had a right to get along, to work as a team, to have a break during shift, and to be valued. “We have our rights um, well, the way I see it when we are at work we all work together as a team. I don’t think it’s fair that someone do work and then some are just sitting there” (P3). Another partner discussed rights in terms of job acquisition and job security. The right to have a job and to keep a job was discussed in terms of “I have the right to have a job...I have the rights to stay here” (P5).

The partners did not have an abundance of remarks to put forth regarding their “rights” in the workplace. However, the brief remarks did focus on safety, workplace morale and job security.

Being Valued and Respected

The partners expressed feeling valued and respected in terms of the manner in which they treated each other. “Um, I think most partners know, most partners know about respect” (P6). Three partners felt a sense of value when chosen by the job coach to do a specific task. “Well, mm I don’t know how to put it because it’s not just me but other partners feel they are respected too” (P3). “Well, because I’m a hard worker and my coach has at times selected me to help out and not others” (P2). Partners described feeling valued in the sense of feeling they were an important part of the business.

Business Advice

Partners described the type of advice they would provide to an apprentice or new partner of the business. They also expressed advice for someone who may consider starting a Coffee Shed in another region.

Advice to a new partner. The partners’ advice to a new apprentice starting out in the business included providing social introductions to existing partners, job coaches and other auxiliary people in the business environment. The partners also discussed passing on advice regarding work ethic, the importance of observing to learn from existing partners, the importance of teamwork, and the need to observe the dress code and work rules. In terms of social introductions, one partner said: “Important to introduce our names... also introduce them to the cleaner or job coach if [he/she] is around at that

point...[and] try your best” (P6). This partner also explained: “My first advice is um, welcome to the team” (P1).

The focus on imparting work behaviour norms to new partners included the advice: “Um, bring your lunch, wear your Coffee Shed shirt... be on time” (P5); “Prove to me that you really want to be here (P4) and “No cell phones, no iPods um, not fall asleep (P1).

Advice for someone starting a new SPE. The advice the partners’ would offer to someone who was thinking of starting an SPE or a new Coffee Shed included issues related to location, finances, market identification and personnel. There was clear advice expressed in terms of the importance of location selection. “Go look at the place where you wanted it to be, so you have an idea what the place is like and see how big it is and imagine where the [Coffee Shed] would be...check with the person who is in charge of the building” (P6).

Market advice was given to incorporate a catering service into the business with comments such as “...about catering like, catering makes popular” (P5). Other advice was given to acquire the necessary finances: “Do they have the finance for it?” (P3). Human resources advice provided included the importance of emphasizing teamwork and selecting high-quality workers. “I think the people who join a business like this, they have to be willing to work together, because otherwise it’s not going to work out” (P4).

Thus, the partners provided valuable advice stemming from their personal experiences in the business and acknowledging what aspects are important factors to consider. These recommendations ranged from geographical elements to marketing and organizational aspects of the business.

Emergent Themes

The inductive analysis of the three Coffee Sheds brought forth four dominant themes that ran across the three worksites consistently. These four themes were partnership, relationships, work ethic, and teamwork; themes that mirrored key elements in the deductive analysis. Relationships were divided into four categories including customers, job coaches, other partners, and friendships. Work ethic was also divided into the categories of work rules and group dynamics.

Partnership. The partners discussed the process of apprenticing and training to become a partner, the decision making power of the partners' voting a partner into or out of the business, the importance of supporting each other, working in harmony, monthly meetings, confidentiality, the official agreement between partners and the business, and the key criterion for partnership entry: "...the person that comes to be partners in our business, they have to be someone with a disability" (P3).

The partners portrayed the apprenticeship process as an opportunity for partners to observe the partner candidate and consider whether the person is a compatible fit with the existing partnership group. If the candidate's suitability was questionable, the apprenticeship period of three months may be extended to allow time to make a clearer hiring decision. The partners worked on a democratic system of voting as a group to accept or deny a new partnership applicant. "I can apprentice for three months and now I'm a partner, and partners have to work things out together... and if partners decide not to work here anymore, then it's up to the other partners to vote them out (P1).

Monthly meeting were held with the partners and a business agenda was covered. Partners played an active role in the meetings with the support of a job coach when

required. As one partner commented: "...sometimes the job coach [runs the meeting] or sometimes the job coach get one of the partners to run it because they want you to run because it's basically as they would say, it's your business" (P3). The partners used the meeting times to discuss what suggestions may be brought forth as ideas to improve the Coffee Shed. Other agenda items were topics such as reviewing the partnership agreement and its content. "A partnership agreement is you're gonna work together as a team, you're helping us pull the weight, you not going to just sit and let other people do the work" (P3).

Each partner had equal voting power in the group business. Partners explained how work infractions were addressed in the business. A partner's misconduct would be identified and three opportunities were allowed for the partner to change their infraction toward the expected/acceptable behaviour. If the misconduct continued past the third chance, a partner could be voted out of the business by the remaining partners. "But the voting out really has to be serious... so when you vote someone out, or let them go from the job, you have to make sure you're doing it for a good reason, not just because you don't like them – that's not a good reason" (P6).

In summary, the partnership was described as a form of democracy with equal voting power among the partners. Apprentices were given ample time to learn the job and prove their worth: "...prove to me that you really want to be here" (P3) prior to being voted in or out of the business. Business matters were run with a specific structure and monthly meetings provided a venue for partner input, feedback and collaboration. Each Coffee Shed ran on the same business model and organizational structure.

Relationships. The theme of relationships was evident throughout the data. The four categories of relationships that emerged included the partners' relationship with customers, with job coaches, with each other as partners and with each other as friends. All four relationship categories revealed different types of relationships and different levels of social connection. For example, customers tended to represent a source of business revenue but also contributed to the partners' personal work needs with such situations as "our customers are [people who work in the building] and they understand where you are coming from and they don't rush you, like they don't say oh hurry up I need my order blah blah blah" (P3). Another example of mixed levels of relationship dynamics was with job coaches who were described as holding a dual role of sometimes providing business support and occasionally providing emotional support.

Customers. Partners described how they looked forward to interacting with the customers and emphasized the importance of maintaining a professional demeanor with them. It was recognized that the customer was a key component to the success of the business and treating them in a calm and positive manner was required. "The business, basically is that you have to, the customer is the most important person when it comes into the Coffee Shed" (P2). Working with customers was described as a positive component factor for the partner as well. As one partner explained, there is a social aspect to the customer connection: "Sometimes when you may feel down... I don't know the customer just comes and says something and they just make you smile" (P3).

Job coaches. The partners described the various areas in their job that the job coach helped them with. These areas included duties, dealing with customers and dealing with personal issues and concerns with each other. "My favourite part about working here

is my job coach, and [the job coach] is always there for me. If I have problems, then [the job coach] is right there” (P1). In contrast, as described earlier in the deductive analysis, an unpopular relationship was described between a partner and the job coach: “Well, like there’s one I really don’t like but I try to stay away from [him/her]” (P4).

Partners. The partners described their relationship with their colleagues as supportive. They reported feeling connected to each other and that they shared the experience of having a disability. As one partner said, “...you feel like you’re not alone whereas at the other business that I did, I felt like I was alone ‘cause I was the only one that had a disability... whereas with the other job I didn’t feel like I belong[ed]” (P3).

Partners described feeling the death of a partner as a deep loss that had a serious impact on the surviving partners. In some cases partners were described as being similar to family in relationship with each other. The importance of making sure everyone was connected and belonging was paramount. “Well, that I’m always included in whatever is going on...[they] printed out what had happened at the meeting that they had Wednesday for me so I could read it” (P2).

Partners unanimously spoke of each other in a respectful and valued way. They described upholding a code of ethics that promoted teamwork, professionalism and meaningful social connections.

Friendships. Partners spoke of applying for the business partnership because they had a friend already working for the business or to meet new friends. “This job is coworkers, um, there’s more coworkers around which is good in a way ‘cause you’re out, you’re trying to make friends, you’re trying to meet other people (P6). As one partner stated clearly: “It’s friends, partner’s friends, friendship” (P5). The partners’ comments

made a clear impression that the social component of being a partner promoted personal enrichment in addition to employment.

Relationship components. The partners revealed that the four major types of associations in the business involve customers, job coaches, partners, and friends. These connections developed to varying levels of intensity. Some relationships were described as practical requirements to sustain the needs of the business while other relationships were described in terms of intrinsic development that enhanced the partners' well-being.

Work Ethic

The partners were consistent in emphasizing the need for a positive work ethic to be present to characterize an effective partner and to maintain a successful business. An effective partner gained recognition by being a hard worker and being responsible or dependable: "...[M]y coach has at times selected me to help her out and not others because she knows I'll do the work... just sit around... that's not the idea of work" (P2). Their work ethic included following the work rules as well as the group dynamics of the partnership: "And we got to work as a team" (P3).

Work rules. The partners described many practical work rules including no use of cell phones and wearing appropriate attire such as "Wear your Coffee Shed shirt... we don't care what kind of pants you wear" (P5). Work rules also included paying for any food items a partner consumed while working, being on time, and not sleeping during your working hours.

Group dynamics. The emphasis on teamwork and mutual support was noted with comments such as "...we all try to help each other keep this job... We do try to be together, we all try to help each other keep this job" (P5). The group norms were

characterized as professionalism combined with work abilities as evidenced in remarks such as: "...we got to work together as a team and you get to work at your own pace whereas at [person's last job of competitive employment] you have to work really, really fast and I'm not going on my own pace" (P4). Also, the group expectations were related to work conditions and were evident in the partners' responses to many interview questions. The aspect of working together and supporting each other was a frequently repeated aspect of this theme.

The importance of respectful interactions with other partners was emphasized: "have good behaviour, try to work together as a team" (P1). The requirement to maintain a respectful disposition with customers was stressed with the comment: "don't be rude to the customers" (P4). One partner expressed: "...the idea of the partners is that we all work together... I've watched other partners and some partners can be passive aggressive, but of course I don't want to be...so I keep it to myself" (P2).

Teamwork

As noted already in many responses by the partners, the concept of teamwork appeared to be a core competency for the business and the partnership. "I think the people who join a business like this, they have to be willing to work together, because otherwise it's not going to work out" (P2). Teamwork was presented as a key factor to partnership and business success.

Within Worksite Themes

One worksite. In this worksite, both partners described independently riding the TTC to get to work. They also spoke of the voting process for apprenticeships and partnerships and of personal goals for obtaining jobs in competitive community

employment in the future. Both spoke of partners as friends: “Because I love working at [Coffee Shed location] because I’m happy about it and I like meeting new friends” (P1) as well as reporting how they became partners through transitioning from school placements to CGC. “I had a friend from [name’s location] that worked here and I met a friend [name’s person], she is one of the other partners” (P6). Both partners viewed their job at the Coffee Shed as “work” to make money and not a volunteer position: “...and it’s part time because I’m only working two shifts in the morning” (P6). They spoke very highly of their work and displayed a strong sense of pride in their job. “The customers give us tips because our business is so good” (P1). Both partners emphasized the importance of working together as a team and that their boss was the partnership group itself.

In terms of human rights, one partner spoke about their rights with reference to physical harm: “... a safe right say if we don’t like something going on, we could probably say it and if it was putting us at harm, we could probably say it” (P6). In contrast, the other partner appeared to have no awareness of their rights. One partner spoke of being involved with the process of hiring a job coach: “if the job coach who works here for seven years and sometimes a job coach may be retired and the partners decide to um to interview for the next job coach to come in” (P1). The second partner felt they had no choice concerning the job coach selection. One of the partners spoke about being the boss and “our business” (P1) while the other partner saw the landlord of the building as the boss.

A second worksite. Both partners spoke of the job tasks they had learned from working at the business. They discussed what rights they felt they had on the job. Both

partners choose to work for the SPE instead of another community job. They spoke of their voting power as a partner and their desire to work more hours and to make more money: "...depending on how many hours you work, you get a certain amount of money, but it still does not measure up... a similar job outside you would get more money" (P2). Both partners understood that the customer was paramount to making money and ensuring the success of the business. They understood the importance of enticing customers to purchase from their Coffee Shed: "We are trying to think of a way to get people outside to come here" (P2).

One of the partners spoke of the convenience of being able to bus or walk to work depending on the weather: "It is close to my home, very close. I could walk. I take the bus, but as summer is coming, I walk home" (P5). A partner spoke with great pride about their ability to work hard and to be chosen by the job coach to undertake specific jobs. In terms of relationships, one partner spoke of friendship with partners and the other spoke of the challenges in dealing with a difficult partner and described how partners "have to maintain partnership" (P2). With regard to the work environment, one partner spoke of the quiet work environment as an example of positive working conditions. A partner described the Coffee Shed business as an attempt to simulate the real world and described the Coffee Shed as providing services that were equivalent to those in other coffee businesses, however, partners at the Coffee Shed made less money for the same job description: "[The pay] is as fair as the Coffee Shed is concerned, but it doesn't measure up to the real world" (P2).

The third worksite. Both partners spoke of the partnership and the voting process for apprenticeship, sharing the workload, and teaching other partners the

important aspects of the job. Both partners spoke of other SPEs that were affiliated with the Coffee Shed including the catering and cleaning businesses. They spoke of the importance of the catering aspect of CGC to generate a substantial amount of income: “We learned how important it is to do catering. We didn’t quite understand that the catering is really, really important because we do a lot of money from the caterings...” (P3).

Both partners had the future goal of obtaining competitive employment. Both felt their ideas, suggestions and desires were heard by other partners and job coaches. Both partners also reported a strong feeling of belonging within the work environment: “Yeah, so whereas with the other job I didn’t feel like I belong[ed]” (P4). The work environment was described as being compatible with their work needs with descriptors such as safe, quiet, and conducive to a slower pace. Neither partner had an understanding of what their rights were within the work environment. Both partners spoke of holding a leadership role in teaching new partners who enter the business, helping a partner who is having difficulty with a task and covering the Coffee Shed while the job coach is off-site.

One partner discussed their independence on the job to the point of not requiring a job coach for any tasks, while the other described certain tasks where they required the job coach’s support on a regular basis. One partner acknowledged themselves as the boss and the owner of the business. The other partner saw the job coach as the boss and the Executive Director of CGC as “the big boss” (P4). In terms of commitment, one of the partners willingly chose to travel a substantial distance to commute to this job. “[My family is] happy about [my job] but then sometimes... they are like why are you travelling so far just for little amount of money” (P4).

Across-Sites Themes

While the nature of the three different work sites may have represented three different types of physical work environments, the three sites reflected continuity in numerous themes. The partners described their time spent at the Coffee Shed as paid “work”. They spoke of the job tasks they had learned since working at the SPE, the necessity of teamwork, the emphasis on partnership and relationship building, the many benefits of the job, the enjoyment of the job, earning money and the importance of proper customer service practices. Work rules and work ethic were emphasized by all partners across the three worksites.

Partners at one site communicated that they were satisfied with the income they made from the business. Partners in the same work site also portrayed themselves as the main decision makers in the business and in the day-to-day conclusions reached. In contrast, the two other sites had partners who described their level of income as unsatisfactory. In one work site the partners reported that the job coaches and CGC staff were the bosses and decision-makers. In the third site left to mention, the partners described the role as “bosses” of the partnership aspect of the business and emphasized teamwork as the key factor to decision-making.

Across the worksites, the partners were satisfied with their job position, felt valued as a partner and did not express any immediate need to work in a different job in the integrated competitive employment sector but they did have career goals and did not feel “stuck” in their current job in any way or limited in future options for employment.

Discussion

People with a developmental disability, according to the Institute for Research on Inclusion and Society (Crawford, 2011), have been shown to experience low rates of employment (24.9%) and high rates of marginalization in the mainstream sector (Hall, 2004). In fact, “people with intellectual disabilities are much more likely (at 39%)... to indicate that they have never worked in their lives” (Crawford, 2011, p. 11). Employment options for this population tends to include either sheltered workshops that offer repetitive and meaningless work tasks in a work environment and that promotes physical and social exclusion or competitive meaningful work in an integrated community environment that is expected to promote physical and social inclusion (Hall, 2010). The traditional viewpoint of social inclusion has been based on the assumption that people with a DD should be afforded the same opportunities as other people to obtain paid community employment. These opportunities have been guided by the four key principles of rights, independence, personal choice and personal control (Department of Health, 2001). However, as Hall (2010) has suggested physical or geographical inclusion does not guarantee meaningful social inclusion, or belonging, in the integrated workplace. People with DD tend to continue experiencing social exclusion within the physically inclusive work environment and continue being treated as an “outsider” even from within (Hall, 2005). With the model of normalization (Nirje, 1999) people with DD were offered inclusion by providing them with the same opportunities to get a job as other people who were not identified as having a disability. However, this approach to inclusive employment also exposed people to negative and hostile attitudes and behaviour from others in their environment (Hall, 2004). This treatment has included physical and verbal

abuse, bullying, and discrimination (Hall, 2004). The estimated rate of employee discrimination experienced by this population was noted to be 50.6% for those who are active in the labour force (Crawford, 2011).

The results of the present study supported Hall's description of social exclusion existing in the mainstream sector of employment. The partners' recounting of their experience in previous competitive employment and their difficulty in maintaining such employment long-term illustrated the kinds of exclusion that await persons with DD in settings that would usually be identified as inclusive. The partners described their community jobs as stressful, demanding and unaccommodating to their abilities. Looking at the social businesses of the Coffee Sheds as an employment option for people with a DD, physical and social inclusion seemed to mesh and compliment the workplace. The businesses were described by the partners as promoting the four traditional principles of social inclusion (rights, independence, personal choice and control) but also modelled Hall's notion of social inclusion in terms of people feeling valued, attached and connected.

The Four Traditional Principles of Social Inclusion

One major focus of this research was to examine the partners' perception of the nature of their job in reference to the four principles associated with the traditional notion of social inclusion; rights, independence, personal choice and personal control. The results reflected the partners' experiences of choice, independence, and elements of control in their description of their entry into and participation in their worker-owned businesses. However, while traditional conceptions of inclusion have focused on participation by persons with a DD in workplaces that were dominated by those who

were not labelled as having a disability, the Coffee Sheds reflected Hall's(2010) conceptions of "insiderness" and belonging in a group that did not "other" those who were so identified. The dynamic tension between notions of inclusion and the right to be in a community with people who shared similar life experiences was reflected in these findings.

The second focus of this study was to consider Hall's (2010) viewpoint of people with a DD moving beyond the traditional principles of social inclusion with its focus on integrated geographical space and towards a space that promotes an authentic sense of belonging. The four traditional principles were reviewed as foundational components to Hall's (2010) belonging and "insiderness." Hall's three criteria for social inclusion were captured in the partners' descriptions of their businesses, however, the four traditional principles may have provided the instrumental component of social inclusion that supported the affective components of belonging. Thus, rights, independence, personal choice and personal control remained valuable aspects of social inclusion for participants as well as the sense of belonging and "insiderness" that they described as important aspects of being partners in the Coffee Sheds.

The connection between the four principles and the three criteria illustrates social inclusion not as a series of events but more as the factors that both support and are supported by authentic relationships. The presence of these principles and criteria is more nuanced than might be suggested by mere lists of descriptors. True social inclusion is dynamic and interactive. While the presence of both the principles and the criteria would appear to be necessary to create authentic social inclusion it is real human being to human being relationships that drives the factors that support inclusion.

The essential emergent outcome of this study's findings is the centrality of these authentic relationships to the realization of social inclusion. Imagine relationship-based social inclusion as the traveller/driver in a vehicle where the four principles of social inclusion represent the engine and Hall's (2010) criteria are the steering wheel. For as much as the foundation of the traditional principles create the structure of the vehicle, Hall's criteria are the fuel. The central component of relationships drives true social inclusion. A person's rights, independence, personal choice, and personal control generate feeling valued, attached and connected. However, relationships within the workplace as well as abroad, drive enactment of the principles and the criteria to mobilize the journey of social inclusion. Social relationships of friendship and social support within the CGC associated partnerships, with job coaches and with customers as well as professional relationships and community relationships drive and are supported by both the foundational four traditional principles and Hall's three criteria of social inclusion.

Independence and interdependence. There was evidence of the principle of independence in the partners' description of how they were supported to do things for themselves during their work hours and the ways in which they described their duties. Through the examination of the partners' responses, it was evident that the partners participated in an apprenticeship program that promoted a process of learning meaningful work tasks and developing a large repertoire of job skills. The program aimed to teach apprentices and new partners as much independence as possible with the need for a job coach only when full independence was not attainable. Partners expressed different levels of independence on the job and different levels of job coach support required to complete

their job tasks. Partners spoke of pride in the skills they had mastered in their training and in their ongoing role in the businesses. However, interdependence among partners was also encouraged and sustainability of partnership was promoted within the business model. The value of this interdependency was stressed by the partners who reflected on the importance of teamwork in their businesses.

Rights. Interview questions elicited responses that indicated that some of the Coffee Shed partners were aware of their rights in the workplace and expressed the ability to exercise those rights (The Council of Quality and Leadership, 2005). Some of the partners understood their right to obtain and maintain a job in the larger community. They took this understanding a step further by exercising the legal right to own a business. Safety and freedom from personal harm were also expressed as rights. As well, the right “to get along” was expressed and was interpreted as the right to be treated well and with respect.

Personal choice. Partners described examples of their ability to engage in self-determination in areas such as their preferences within the work setting. The indicators of enactment of personal choice included participating in partner meetings on a monthly basis, as well as partners describing their individual work goals. All partners communicated the impression that they freely choose to work at the Coffee Shed and envisioned another competitive employment option as a possibility for them in the future. All the partners had a dream job that existed in the mainstream sector but not one partner gave the impression that they were unhappy working at the Coffee Shed or wished to change from this job soon. The partners had the freedom to democratically vote on the hiring and firing of business partners.

However, the partners' lack of personal choice was seen in the job coach selection with inconsistent reports from partners about their involvement in hiring coaches. Also, there was not a process for complaints or for grievances that was described by the partners. The expectation of a traditional business would be that the owners hire and fire their staff, which would include support staff in this case. The contradiction to the traditional business model was that CGC funded and managed the wages of the support staff and thus carried the responsibilities around matters such as Ministry of Community and Social Services regulations. Thus, partners had the opportunity for free choice in regards to their partnership matters but not within the overhead administrative matters. This reflects the fact that this SPE is a mixed model that includes worker owned businesses that are supported by a support service cooperative.

Another example of lack of choice was the fact that partners were dependent upon social assistance to generate their main source of income. This subsidy limited the partners' choice around earning a substantial pay check from the businesses' profit levels if sufficient to provide substantial raises. Thus, the financial restrictions of the partners' amount of income earned through their own businesses impacted their perception of an income that should have been self-determined and open to be raised. Importantly, however, this condition would exist in any mainstream employment for this group of people. Thus, this example of the partners' lack of personal choice on the job is not specific to their social business.

Personal control. The principle of personal control was considered present because the interview questions elicited responses that indicated partners actively participated in and assisted with portions of the businesses. Personal control was reflected

in the partners' autonomy to make decisions that affected their direct work situation and their direction of their own business development within the day-to-day operations at the Coffee Sheds. Personal control was also indicated when partners described their leadership skills and when they were supported with taking on leadership roles such as teaching new partners.

The four principles of social inclusion. Through the course of the interviews with these partners, they described the operations of their specific worksite. Many descriptions referred to the traditional definition of the four principles of social inclusion. In the process of describing the nature of their work, the partners provided details that demonstrated satisfy these four principles within their businesses and their decision making role in the organization. Overall, the four principles of social inclusion were present in these social businesses.

Hall's (2010) Three Criteria for Social Inclusion

The second part of this study examined the partners' description of their work in reference to Hall's (2010) concept of inclusion as a sense of "insiderness" and belonging, especially with regard to the emotional aspect of social inclusion. Hall's perspective of the affective component of social inclusion was explored through the described experiences of the partners in terms of feeling valued, feeling connected to the community that used their services and feeling attached to their workplace.

Feeling valued. The partners described feeling they had a positive image/reputation in the general community. They expressed this element of inclusion extensively in their description of the expected work ethic and work rules in their businesses. This was reflected in the partners' descriptions of being comfortable and

confident to pursue their personal dreams and their descriptions of their work as being meaningful. Each partner had future aspirations and employment goals. A crucial feature of feeling valued was the partners' expressions of being treated with respect. This value was solidified in the way they treated each other in a supportive, professional and fair manner. Respect was expressed in their description of how the partners interacted with each other and how job coaches and customers interacted with the partners in a manner that promoted respect without drawing undue attention to the partners' disability or difference (Council of Quality and Leadership, 2005). Respect and being valued were evident in the partners' pride and confidence in being their "own bosses".

Feeling connected to the community. The aspect of feeling connected was considered present because the interview questions elicited responses that reflected the partners expressing connections to other people that demonstrated social networking and their image of themselves as being part of a larger community. The partners described past employment in the community and future goals of employment in mainstream employment. They did not portray any sense of feeling limited in their current work opportunity or of feeling limited in achieving future opportunities in mainstream employment should they choose to pursue it. Their workplace was described as a worksite in the community rather than a segregated worksite with the exception of one partner in one location who spoke of "the outside". Thus, the partners did not portray any sense of segregation or isolation from the community at large. The partners described community contacts and community resources such as transportation or skills training programs. The partners expressed their work as authentic rather than simulated and as a meaningful and purposeful activity. The partners expressed a sense of valued engagement

with their customers. They described a business relationship of reciprocity where the partners were elated with the high quality of service they provided to customers and the enjoyment of a social connection and the financial benefit they received back from customers. All the partners described their businesses as an important service that they provided to their customers.

Feelings of attachment to the work environment. This element of Hall's (2010) social inclusion was considered present because the interview questions elicited responses that included partners feeling safe and secure in their work environment. The expectations and protocol for maintaining a secure partner membership were made clear and consistent. There appeared to be no hidden agendas because each partner consistently described the partnership practice and what rules were to be followed. The partners' feelings of being "bonded" to other people at the worksite were evident in repeated descriptions of how they treated each other in a respectful and professional manner. They expressed feeling a sense of acceptance with an essence of group-belonging and feeling included. The description of partners' developing friendship among themselves was extensive and impressive. The partnership model promoted a sense of belonging and "insiderness" for partners at the Coffee Sheds which contrasted with the partners' experiences with being "othered" and feeling a sense of being "out of place" in the competitive job sector. Hall (2005) discussed community with an in-group verses community as a geographic and majority population location. Common Ground Cooperative was able to support this group of people to establish Hall's social community in the realm of an employment forum that upholds belonging and "insiderness". Clearly, the notion of social inclusion must be shifted from merely

providing geographical access to employment to an innovative restructuring of how work can be socially and spatially organised. As Hall (2005) claimed and this study supported: “a sense of safety and a type of ‘inclusion’ can be achieved by self-exclusion from the spaces and activities of the majority” (p. 109).

Limitations of the Study

There were three major limitations regarding the conduct of this study. First, a small sample size per worksite provided a minimal representation of the partners at each location and restricted achieving saturation across locations. With time and funding permitting, a larger sample size would have provided results with a broader perspective including more partner diversity. Second, a member check was not completed and therefore confirmation of overall themes and outcomes was not established. Member checking would have had to be conducted in person in order to ensure that the information was accessible to all participants. Again, with time and funding more readily available, completing a member check would have provided a further measure of confidence in the interview outcomes.

Third, communication barriers may have influenced some results due to language comprehension differences and misinterpretations. To explain this further, through the interview process, it may have been possible that interpretation of some questions impacted the partners’ answers. An example would be the interview question that was inquiring about the business’ ownership and who was the “boss”. The partners’ interpretation of this question varied with some understanding it to mean “who is the boss of the business” and others “who is the boss of the partners”. Those two interpretations may have produced very different answers to the same question when asked. The

misinterpretation of language could have also occurred on the part of the researcher analysing the partners' responses. This factor was the time when a member check would have solidified the interview outcomes. To the study's advantage, the researcher's lengthy experience working in the field involving people with a DD was a benefit to this limitation in comparison to a researcher who did not carry this experience into the interviewing process.

Conclusion

The three Coffee Shed social businesses explored in this study were excellent examples of an employment model that was strongly comparable to Hall's (2010) case studies. "Despite emphasis on the importance of paid work as a route to social inclusion, mainstream employment in capitalist economies continues to perpetuate the marginalization and oppression of disabled people" (Hall and Wilton, 2011, p. 876). The business' partnerships were based on membership that was exclusive to people with a DD. The partners were happy with their work activity. They valued the work and saw themselves as "active citizens." The businesses occupied geographic spaces that varied in their proximity to mainstream commerce with two being located in social support agencies for which there was only indirect access for the general public. Social networking was a valued characteristic of the partnerships. Participants described forming friendships, emotional support, and social capital among themselves and between themselves and their job coaches. This form of "bonding" Hall (2010) explained to be a very important feature of social inclusion that was fostered in a "safe space" and built "a sense of self-identity to engage with an often difficult and discriminatory mainstream world" (p. 55).

For people with a DD who are seeking paid employment, the focus needs to shift from improving the employability of this group to examining how to create mainstream workplaces that are more accommodating (Hall and Wilton, 2011). As Hall (2010) stated:

“to achieve belonging is much more than being socially included (as it is normally envisaged). To belong is to feel attached, to feel valued, and to have a sense of “insiderness” and proximity to ‘majority’ people, activities, networks and spaces” (p. 56).

Through the collective voices of the partners, CGC has been described as supporting an employment model that upholds Hall’s (2010) criteria of social inclusion for this group of people. CGC has assisted persons with a DD to break away from the stigma and stereotypes (Grant, 2008) about their capabilities in the labour force. The partners of the Coffee Sheds saw themselves as valued citizens, described their gain in social capital (Condeluci, 2002) and their sense of having prestige in their status as their own “bosses” with self-determination embraced.

To compliment this study three recommendations are put forth. First, future research would be encouraged to include a qualitative study involving partners from the other SPE businesses to compare and possibly replicate these results. Second, future research may consider examining people with a DD in competitive jobs and take into account the perceptions of their work experiences in terms of Hall’s three criteria of social inclusion comparing their perceptions to those of the Coffee Shed partners. Finally, with the positive results from this study, it is recommended that an operations manual be developed that would guide and direct the creation of SPE businesses in other geographical areas for people who experience marginalization in the work force.

Replication of this employment model as a viable and socially satisfying form of genuine work for other people with a DD would be a gratifying endeavour.

References

- Baker, P. A. (2007). Individual and service factor affecting deinstitutionalization and community use of people with Intellectual Disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 20, 105–109.
- Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers. *The Qualitative Report* 13(4), 544–559.
Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR13-4/baxter.pdf>
- Boyatzis, R. (1998). Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development. Sage Publications, Inc. Thousands Oaks, California.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3: 77–101, doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Burge, P., Quellette-Kuntz, H., & Lysaght, R. (2007). Public views on employment of people with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 26, 29–47.
- Canadian Association for Community Living. (June 2010). Position Statement on Income Security. Retrieved from: <http://www.ccdonline.ca/en/socialpolicy/poverty-citizenship/CACL>
- Carlson, L. (2001). Cognitive ableism and disability studies: feminist reflections on the history of mental retardation. *Hypatia*, 16, 124–146.
- CLEO (Community Legal Education Ontario, May 2010). *Social Assistance: Working and the Ontario Disability Support Program*. Retrieved from: www.cleo.on.ca
- Community Living Research Project (October 2006). *Non-Residential Supports and Intellectual Disability: A Review of the Literature on Best Practices, Alternatives*

- and Economic Impacts*. School of Social Work and Family Studies, Vancouver: The University of British Columbia.
- Council on Quality and Leadership Quality Measures (2005). *Shared Values*. Retrieved from: www.thecouncil.org
- Condeluci, A. (2002). *Cultural Shifting*. Training Resource Network, Inc., St. Augustine, Florida.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of Qualitative Research (3e)*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications Inc.
- Crawford, C. (2011). *The Employment of people with Intellectual Disabilities in Canada: A Statisical Profile*. The Institute for Research on Inclusion and Society. Toronto: York University,
- Emerson, E., & Stancliffe, R. (2004). Planning and Action: Comments on Mansell & Beadle-Brown. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 17, 23–26.
- Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5 (1), 1-11.
- Flynn, Robert J., & Lemay, Raymond A. (1999). *A Quarter-Century of Normalization and Social Role Valorization: Evolution and Impact*. Ottawa : University of Ottawa Press.
- Galambos, D. (1999). Work and Employment for People with Developmental Disabilities in Ontario. In Brown, Ivan., and Percy, Maire, *Developmental Disabilities in Ontario (pp. 139–156)*, Toronto : Front Porch Publishing.

- Grant, J. (2008). Paid work: A valued social role that is empowering more people with an intellectual disability and providing employers with dedicated employees. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*, 33(1), 95–97.
- Hall, E. (2004). Social geographies of learning disability: Narratives of exclusion and inclusion. *Area* 36, 298–306
- Hall, E. (2005). The entangled geographies of social exclusion/inclusion for people with learning disabilities. *Health & Place*, 11, 107–115, doi: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2004.10.007
- Hall, E. (2010). Spaces of social inclusion and belonging for people with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 54, 48–57, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2788.2009.01237.x
- Hall, E., & Wilton, R. (2011). Alternative spaces of ‘work’ and inclusion for disabled people, *Disability & Society*, 26:7, 867–880, doi: 10.1080/09687599.2011.618742
- Kober, R., & Eggleton, I.R.C. (2005). The effect of different types of employment on quality of life. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 49(10), 756–760.
- Klotz, J. (2004). Sociocultural study of Intellectual Disability: Moving beyond labelling and social constructionist perspectives. *British Journals of Learning Disabilities*, 32, 93–104.
- Lachapelle, Y. (2003). What is Intellectual Disability? Available from: www.declarationmontreal.com/docs/intellectual_disability.pdf
- Lemon, C., & Lemon, J. (2003). Community-based cooperative ventures for adults with intellectual disabilities. *The Canadian Geographer*, 47(4), 414–428.

- Lord, J., & Hearn, C. (1987). *Return to the Community: The Process of Closing an Institution*. Kitchener, Ontario, Canada: Centre for Research and Education in Human Services.
- Maxwell, Joseph A. (2005). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Mirfin-Veitch, B., Bray, A., & Ross, N. (2003). "It was the hardest and most painful decision of my life!": Seeking permanent out-of-home placement for sons and daughters with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*. 28(2), 99–111.
- Nirje, B. (1999). Formulating the Normalisation Principle. In R.J. Flynn and R.A. Lemay (eds). *A Quarter century of Normalization and Social Role Valorization: evolution and Impact*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Nuames, W., & Nuames, J. (2006). *The Art and Craft of Case Writing*. New York: M.E. Sharpe Inc.
- O'Brien, P., Thesing, A., & Tuck, B. (2001). Perceptions of change, advantage and quality of life for people with intellectual disability who left a long stay institution to live in the community. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*. 26(1), 67–82.
- Owen, F., & Griffith, D. (2009). *Challenges to the Human Rights of People with Intellectual Disabilities*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Parkinson, G. (2006). Counsellors' attitudes towards Disability Equality Training (DET). *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 43(1), 93–105, doi: 10.1080/03069880500483182

- Quarter, J., Mook, L., & Armstrong, A. (2009). *Understanding The Social Economy A Canadian Perspective*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Quinn Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. Thousand Oakes, California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Radford, J.P., & Tipper, A. (1988). *Starcross: Out of the Mainstream*. Toronto: The G. Allan Roeher Institute.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The Cultural Nature of Human Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sandys, J. (1999). Work and Employment for People with Developmental Disabilities in Ontario. In I. Brown and M. Percy, *Developmental Disabilities in Ontario (pp. 139–156)*, Toronto: Front Porch Publishing.
- Simmons, H. G. (1982). *From Asylum to Welfare*. Downsview, Ontario, Canada: National Institute of Mental Retardation.
- Verdugo, M.A., Jordan de Umes, F.B., Jenaro, C., Caballo, C., & Crespo, M. (2006). Quality of Life of Workers with an Intellectual Disability in Supported Employment. *Journal of Applied research in Intellectual Disabilities*. 19, 309–316.
- Weisel, I. (2009). Community and the geography of people with intellectual disability. *Social and Cultural Geography*. 10(5), 599–613.
- Weber, K. (2008). *Why Social Business Is Capitalism's Missing Link*. Harvard Business Report, Retrieved from: <http://blogs.hbr.org/good-business/2008/11/social-businesscapitalisms-mis.html>

Wolfensberger, W. (2000). A brief overview of Social Role Valorization. *Mental Retardation*, 38(2), 105–123.

Wolfensberger, W. (1972). *The Principles of Normalization in Human Services*. Toronto, National Institute of Mental Retardation(The Roeher Institute).

Yunus, M. (2007). *Creating a World without Poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism*. New York: Public Affairs.

Yunus, M. (2010). *Building Social Business*. New York: Public Affairs.

Appendix A
Demographic Form

1. Name of Person _____
2. D.O.B. _____
3. Gender _____
4. Name of Worksite _____
5. Length of Employment to this Date _____
6. Past Employment _____
7. Number of Hours Worked Per Week _____
8. Personal Contact Information _____

- Date: _____
- Researcher Name: _____
- Researcher Name: _____

Appendix B

Interview Questions

1. Please tell me about your work at (name of CGC related work site):
 - a. Is this a full time job, a part time job or are you a volunteer? Is there a difference between having a job and being a volunteer?
 - b. How did you get this job?
 - c. Why did you choose to work here?
 - d. What happens at your job?
 - e. What do you do in your job?
 - f. What have you learned while you have been doing this job?
 - g. As part of your job do you teach other people things? What do you teach?
2. Did you work anywhere before this? If so, please describe.
3. What is different about your life since you started working at (name CGC work site).
(Prompts: social, health, skills).
4. Can you describe what it is like being part of (name CGC work site)? What does it mean to be part of running a business? Can you describe how that works? What has to happen for you to get money from (name CGC work site)?
5. What does CGC do?
6. What do you like about your job? (Prompts: the most, the best, makes you happy).
7. What do you not like about your job? (Prompts: the least, the worst, makes you sad).
8. Are you planning to stay in this job or are you hoping to get another job? If so, what kind/where?

9. What advice do you have for someone who is starting to work with you at (name work site)?
10. Are you satisfied with the pay you earn? (Why or why not?)
11. Do you feel valued and respected in your work? Why or why not? How or what tells you that you are valued?
12. How does your family feel about your work at (name CGC work site)?
13. What do the people who work at CGC do to help with your work?
14. What advice would you give to other people who might want to start a business like (name CGC work site)?
15. Tell me about some of your experiences with customers.
16. Is (name CGC work site) a successful business? Why or why not? How can you tell whether a business is a success?
17. What comments do you hear from customers? (Prompt: good, bad).
18. What rights are you able to exercise at CGC?
19. What decisions do you make while working at CGC?
20. Who is your boss?
21. Who owns CGC?
22. If you could have any job in the world, what would that job be? Why?
23. Do you receive ODSP?

Appendix C

Recruitment Notice to be distributed to Common Ground Partners (clients)

We are working with some researchers to help us to write a case study about Common Ground and all the businesses it supports. The researchers would like to talk to partners to learn about your work. The goal of this study is to find out if a business the same as Common Ground would be a good idea to begin in other places.

If you think you might want to help with this study, you will be asked to meet with two researchers to talk about what the study is about and decide if you want to help or not. If you decide you do not want to help with the study, that is fine and you will be thanked for coming to talk with the researchers.

If you decide you would like to help, you will sign a paper saying you agree to help.

If you say yes and sign the paper then we will have the interview right then or at another time if that is better for you. The interview will take about **1&1/2 hours** to do. The interview will be done in a private place and no one except the researchers will know what your answers are to the questions you will be asked. You can have the interview during work time. The interviewers will tape record the interview so they can remember what you tell them.

If you would like to be interviewed by the researchers please tell your job coach or Jeannette Campbell.

That person will tell the researcher that you want to have an interview and will help you and the researchers find a time for you to meet the researchers and have the interview.

The first 15 people who volunteer and set up a time to have a meeting will be interviewed.

You will only help with this study if you choose to help. You are not expected to have to help in any way if you do not wish to do so. If you begin to help and then change your mind, you can stop helping at any time! No one will think or talk badly or do anything bad because you stop helping. It is all good.

ETHICS

The university has a committee that checks this study before the student comes to you. The committee makes sure that this study will not hurt you in anyway. Contact information for the Research Ethics Office is reb@brocku.ca or 905-688-5550 ext. 3035.

CONTACT INFORMATION

If you are interested in meeting with the researchers to see if you want to help with the study please write or ask your job coach to write your name and phone number below.

Your job coach or Jeannette Campbell will send this information to the researchers (Anne Readhead, Frances Owen, and the people who work with them) at this email address: ar92qi@badger.ac.brocku.ca

When the researchers get your information they will call or email your job coach or Jeannette Campbell for help to set up a meeting with you.

NAME: _____

COACH'S NAME: _____

COACH'S CONTACT NUMBER: _____

WORK NUMBER: _____

HOME NUMBER: _____

THANK YOU.

Appendix D

Rationale of Interview Questions

**All interview questions listed below may elicit responses from participants that reflect any/all of traditional social inclusion four principles of *rights independence, personal choice, and personal control*, as well as possibly reflect aspects of Hall's (2010) criteria of belonging involving *feeling valued, a sense of belonging/attachment, and community connectedness*.

**Noted in the rationale column are particular principle(s) and /or social inclusion characteristic(s) that would be expected to reflected specifically in the participants' answer(s) for that question.

Interview Question:	Rationale:
1a. Is this a full time job, a part time job or are you a volunteer? Is there a difference between having a job and being a volunteer?	These questions may elicit responses of employment knowledge in general and/or indicate the partner's self-perception of their work activity.
1b. How did you get this job?	Principle of Independence – did the person acquire the job independently?
1c. Why did you choose to work here?	Principle of Personal Choice – is there indication of personal preference and opportunity of choice?
1d. What happens at your job?	Principle of Personal Control - is there indication of a self-directed work environment?
1e. What do you do in your job?	Principles of Independence, Personal Choice and Personal Control .
1f. What have you learned while you have been doing this job?	Principles of Independence and Personal Control.
1g. As part of your job do you teach other people things? What do you teach?	Principle of Personal Control. Aspects of feeling Valued and Attached.
2. Did you work anywhere before this? If so, please describe.	Principle of Personal Choice.
3. What is different about your life since you started working at (name CGC work site)?	All principles and inclusion aspects.

4. Can you describe what it is like being part of (name CGC work site)? What does it mean to be part of running a business? Can you describe how that works? What has to happen for you to get money from (name CGC work site)?	All principles and inclusion aspects.
5. What does CGC do?	This question may elicit responses of employment knowledge in general to indicate the partner's self-perception of their work activity.
6. What do you like about your job? (Prompts: the most, the best, makes you happy).	All principles and inclusion aspects.
7. What do you not like about your job? (Prompts: the least, the worst, makes you sad).	All principles and inclusion aspects.
8. Are you planning to stay in this job or are you hoping to get another job? If so, what kind/where?	Aspect of Belonging. Principle of Independence.
9. What advice do you have for someone who is starting to work with you at (name work site)?	All principles and inclusion aspects.
10. Are you satisfied with the pay you earn? (Why or why not?)	This question may elicit responses of employment knowledge in general to indicate the partner's self-perception of their work activity.
11. Do you feel valued and respected in your work? Why or why not? How or what tells you that you are valued?	Aspect of Belonging.
12. How does your family feel about your work at (name CGC work site)?	Aspect of Belonging. Principles of Independence and Personal Choice.
13. What do the people who work at CGC do to help with your work?	Aspect of Belonging. Principle of Independence.
14. What advice would you give to other people who might want to start a business like (name CGC work site)?	Aspect of Belonging.
15. Tell me about some of your experiences with customers.	All principles and inclusion aspects.

16. Is (name CGC work site) a successful business? Why or why not? How can you tell whether a business is a success?	This question may elicit responses of employment knowledge in general to indicate the partner's self-perception of their work activity. All principles and inclusion aspects.
17. What comments do you hear from customers? (Prompt: good, bad).	Aspects of Belonging and Connectedness.
18. What rights are you able to exercise at CGC?	Principle of Rights.
19. What decisions do you make while working at CGC?	Principles of Personal Control and Independence. Aspect of Valued.
20. Who is your boss?	This question may elicit responses of employment knowledge in general to indicate the partner's self-perception of their work activity.
21. Who owns CGC?	This question may elicit responses of employment knowledge in general to indicate the partner's self-perception of their work activity.
22. If you could have any job in the world, what would that job be? Why?	Aspect of Attachment.
23. Do you receive ODSP?	This question may elicit responses of employment knowledge in general to indicate the partner's self-perception of their work activity.

Appendix E**Common Ground Case Study Project****Interview Consent Form for Common Ground Partners (clients)**

Researchers: Frances Owen and Anne Readhead, Brock University

Jeannette Campbell, Common Ground

Research Assistants and students who will be working under the supervision of Frances Owen

Name of Participant: (Please print) _____

Witness Question: Would you like to have a job coach stay with you while we describe this project?

Yes _____ No _____

We are doing a research project to see how Common Ground, the Coffee Shed and Lemon and Allspice operate. We want to learn how these businesses are run so we can tell other people who may want to start business like these. We would like to interview you so you can tell us about your work.

Q1: If you agree to have an interview what will we interview you about?

Your participation in the interview will take about one to one and a half hours.

Q2: How long will the interview take?

In the interview you do not have to answer any questions you don't want to answer. You can also stop the interview at any time and nothing bad will happen.

Q3: What can you say if you do not want to answer a question?

You will be audio taped during the interview. This will help us to remember what you told us.

Q5: Are you going to be audio-taped during the interview?

You will receive a \$5 Tim Horton's gift certificate as a thank you for taking the time to have the interview. You can also have the interview during your paid work time. You still get the Tim's card even if you decide you don't want to do the interview or if you stop the interview before it is over.

Q10: Will you be receiving a gift certificate for doing the interview?

Only people from the research team, including those listed on this form, will see the information you give us in the interview. Jeannette Campbell will see the information we get from you but we will take your name off the information so she will not know that you are the one who said it.

Q11: Will people from the research team share your information with anybody else?

During the interview if you tell someone from the research team that you or someone else has been abused we will tell the police about this so you can get help. If you say you have abused someone else, or if you say you are going to hurt yourself or someone else, then we will have to tell your Executive Director, Jeannette Campbell, or the person who is filling in for her if she is not available to be sure that everyone involved is helped. Also, your personal information will have to be given to the courts if the law requires it.

Q12: If you talk to us about abuse, who do we have to tell?

General information from this interview will be shared with other people. When people from the project team share this information they will never use your full name. The research team will give you a summary of the results of the study after it is over if you tell us you want one.

Q13: Will your full name ever be said or written when people from the project team share your information?

Sometimes we have a chance to do other studies. If you agree we can put your name on a list so we can invite you to be in another study if we get to do one. You can say no now and you can also say no if we invite you to another study.

Q14: Do you want us to invite you to other studies if we have any like this in the future?

Yes_____ No_____

Q15: Is it Ok with you if we use what you tell us not just in this study that we are doing now but also in other studies like this one? Just like this study, we will not use your name in the other studies.

Yes_____ No_____

This study has been reviewed by and received ethics clearance from the Brock Research Ethics Board. (File# 10-151) If I have any questions or concerns about my participation in the study, you may contact Frances Owen at 905-688-5550 ext. 4807. You may also contact the Brock University Research Ethics Officer in the Office of Research Services at 905-688-5550 ext. 3035, email: reb@brocku.ca.

I agree:

YES NO

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| • to be a part of a research project that is preparing a case study about Common Ground and its businesses. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • to be audio taped during the interview . | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • that the interviewers can ask me questions about my work. | | |
| • that staff who know me can see a copy of this signed consent form. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • that the information from the interview research can be used in different ways in other research projects to help people to understand how our kind of business runs. | | |
| • to be contacted about participating in other studies like this one. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Participant Signature:_____

Participant Name: (please print) _____

Date: _____

Witness Statement:

I have witnessed the presentation of information and the request for consent for participation in this study and I believe that _____ fully understands the nature of his/her involvement in this study and was not coerced in any manner. By signing as a witness, I also take an oath of secrecy not to divulge any confidential information regarding the participant.

Witness Signature _____

Witness Name: (please print) _____

Relationship to Participant: _____

Date: _____

Thank you for your help! Please take one copy of this form with you for further reference.

I have fully explained the procedures of this study to the above volunteer.

Research Assistant Signature: _____

Research Assistant Name: (Please print) _____

Date: _____